

JPRS-UWE-86-001

2 JANUARY 1986

USSR Report

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No. 10, OCTOBER 1985

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

2 January 1986

USSR REPORT

WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

No 10, October 1985

Except where indicated otherwise in the table of contents the following is a complete translation of the Russian-language monthly journal MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA published in Moscow by the Institute of World Economy and International Relations, USSR Academy of Sciences.

CONTENTS

English Summary of Major Articles (pp 158-159).....	1
Zagladin on Bourgeois, Socialist Revolutions (pp 3-15) (V. Zagladin).....	4
WWII Anniversary Article Hits U.S.-Japanese Security Ties (pp 16-25) (V. Bunin).....	13
U.S., Allies' Role in World Arms Trade (pp 26-37) (S. Blagovolin).....	24
The TNC and Contradictions Between Labor and Capital (pp 38-50) (I. Ivanov) (not translated)	
The 'Information Society' Theory and the Realities of Capitalism (pp 51-63) (N. Gauzner) (not translated)	

OUR CORRESPONDENT ABROAD

French Critiques of SDI Described (pp 64-71) (A. Kudryavtsev).....	37
---	----

OUR COMMENTARY

Israel: What Next? (pp 72-78) (Ye. Dmitriyev).....	49
Vatican Policies Under Pope John Paul II Considered (pp 79-83) (I. Grigulevich).....	60

GLORIOUS ANNIVERSARIES

Forty Years of the Korean People's Freedom and Struggle (pp 84-89)
(L. Yefimov) (not translated)

INTERNATIONAL REVIEW

Survey of World Events June-September 1985 (pp 90-109)
(B. Bolotin, O. Ivanova, V. Rasnitsyn, N. Strel'tsova)..... 69

TRIBUNE OF THE ECONOMIST AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS SPECIALIST

The Emergent Countries: Interaction of Domestic and Foreign
Development Factors (pp 110-122)
(A. El'yanov) (not translated)

SURVEYS, INFORMATION

The FRG in the International Migration of Capital (pp 123-133)
(V. Shumilin) (not translated)

SCIENTIFIC LIFE

UN Sponsors Asian Security Conference in Tashkent (pp 134-137)
(A. Bogomolov)..... 96

BOOKS, AUTHORS

Book on Western Anti-Soviet Propaganda Reviewed (pp 138-139)
(Yu. Oleshchuk)..... 102

Review of Wolf Schneider's "Our Daily Disinformation. How the Mass Media Lead
Us Astray" (pp 140-141)
(I. Yermachenkov) (not translated)

Review of Erwin Rohde's "Banks, Stock Exchanges and Currencies Under
the Conditions of Present-Day Capitalism" (pp 142-143)
(O. Borisova) (not translated)

Siberian Institute Study of Capitalist Economies Reviewed (pp 143-145)
(A. Poletayev)..... 105

Book on History of U.S. Military Strategy, Budget Reviewed (pp 145-147)
(V. Dyakin)..... 108

Swiss Study of U.S.-Soviet Arms Talks Reviewed (pp 147-149)
(L. Vadimov)..... 112

Review of F.M. Sergeyev's "Secret Instrument of Aggression (U.S.
Subversive Activity Against the USSR)" (pp 149-150) (not translated)

STATISTICS

Female Labor in the Capitalist Countries (pp 151-157) (not translated)

PUBLICATION DATA

English title : WORLD ECONOMY AND INTERNATIONAL
RELATIONS No

Russian title : MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE
OTNOSHENIYA

Author(s) :

Editor(s) : Ya.S. Khavinson

Publishing House : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda"

Place of publication : Moscow

Date of publication : October 1985

Signed to press : 13 September 1985

Copies :

COPYRIGHT : Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda".
"Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye
otnosheniya", 1985

ENGLISH SUMMARY OF MAJOR ARTICLES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 158-159

[Text] "The First People's Revolution of the Epoch of Imperialism" (by V. Zagladin) analyzes the peculiarities of the first national revolution of the epoch of Imperialism--the Russian revolution of 1905-1907. The author reveals its roots, points out the role it played in the world-historic development and the experience with which it enriched the world revolutionary-liberation movement. The author convincingly shows that the eighty years which have passed since the revolution have confirmed its great international importance. The article in detail considers the basic aspects of the revolution, above all, those to which V.I. Lenin attached great importance, namely: the revolution of 1905-1907 was a "dress-rehearsal" both of the February bourgeois revolution and the proletarian socialist October revolution. The author describes the way this revolution affected the development of the liberation struggle in other countries and regions; shows that the revolution under consideration opened a new epoch--a period of political upheavals and revolutions. The article discloses why the revolution, which was bourgeois in its socio-economic essence had such progressive consequences both in the East and West. The article devotes much attention to the Leninist methodology of approach to the nature of the first Russian revolution, types of revolutions in general, the present historical epoch included. It also outlines the variety of revolutionary process at the present stage of the historical development and their importance.

The article "Crashing Defeat of Japanese Militarism and Lessons of Today" (by V. Bunin) focuses on the world-wide historic importance of the defeat of the Japanese armed forces in the Far East due to which the correlation of forces in Asia has drastically changed in favor of peace, democracy and socialism, the general crisis of the world capitalist system has deepened and a new development of the national liberation movement has begun. The bourgeois propaganda is minimizing the role of the Soviet Union in the defeat of Japanese militarism and misrepresenting the foreign policy of the USSR as the postwar changes in Asia are not to the liking of imperialist states, above all the USA. They are encouraging revengeful trends in the policy of the ruling circles of Japan and are building the militarist alliance Washington-Tokyo-Seoul. Washington is seeking to draw the countries of the region into its global military-political plans. Therefore, the Asian continent is turning into an additional, Eastern

front of struggle against the socialist community. Today the U.S. and Japanese reactionaries are escalating the arms buildup. They are flouting the decisions of Yalta and Potsdam conferences. The Japanese reactionaries are mounting their revanchist campaign of territorial claims on the Soviet Union. The article shows that Japanese militarism has forgotten the lessons of recent history.

One of the most dangerous manifestations of the growing role of the imperialist military-industrial complexes for the cause of peace is their mounting activity beyond the borders of the USA and the other countries of the aggressive NATO bloc says S. Blagovolin in his article "The Expansion of Military-Industrial Complex on the International Arena". The motive force for such an expansion is the striving to create a military-political and military-economic structure that would correspond to a long-term strategic aims of imperialism in its struggle leveled against the USSR, the socialist community as a whole and all the revolutionary forces fighting for social and national liberation. The author believes that the expansion and deepening of the military and economic relations in the nonsocialist world should be considered as a process of building up the military economy of capitalism, being developed within the framework of the world capitalist economy. The first stage of this process was the expansion of relations within the NATO military-industrial complexes where in the last decades, the backbone of the present global structure has actually been formed. The author states that this phenomenon represents a most grave danger, taking into account the very aim of the militarist preparations of capitalism and their possible effect on the economy and policy of different states, turned into the co-partners of the militarist plans of the most aggressive U.S. and NATO circles.

I. Ivanov in the article "TNC and Contradictions between Labor and Capital" notes that TNC's in capitalist production concentrates a considerable army of wage labor in their enterprises. TNC's have on the one hand turned into a vast arena of capitalist exploitation and on the other--into an arena of class struggle. Employment in TNC enterprises while possessing all common features of wage labor differ in a number of peculiarities. They are due both to the trends of development of present productive forces and to the specific character of TNC activities which are internationalizing the fundamental contradictions between labor and capital under capitalism. The article shows that the TNC's are considerably enhancing the exploitation of wage labor, imparting to it an international character. Moreover they are acquiring considerable freedom for social maneuvering, taking advantage in their interests of the national distinctions in wages and labor conditions, thus splitting and counterposing the national detachments of the proletariat. All this, the author states, simultaneously creates objective conditions in which the working people redouble their efforts against such exploitation, more organically combine economic and political slogans in the class struggle and strengthen proletarian internationalism. The article considers the structural and class aspects of labor in TNC industries where the contradictions between labor and capital are becoming more acute. The author points out that the TNC's spearhead their activities against the organized working class movement. The working people of the capitalist countries keenly feel the need to internationalize the unity of their actions in view of the growing expansive activities of such corporations. The author focuses on the role of the communist and workers' parties, an encouraging and organizing force in the class struggle of the working people against the TNC's. They are guided by the principles of liberation of wage labor and proletarian internationalism.

The new stage of the Scientific and Technological revolution generates far-reaching changes in the economy and public life of the capitalist countries. These changes are considered in the West from the view point of the information society theory, being a modernized version of the theory of "transformation" of capitalism. N. Gauzner in his article "The Theory of Information Society and Reality of Capitalism" combines its criticism with an analysis of the new social problems, generated by the revolution of microelectronics. Emphasizing the significantly growing role of information the author refuses to consider it as an autonomous factor, determining social development. Information in capitalist countries is turning into an important instrument in the competitive struggle, in strengthening the positions of the monopolies, and an instrument of social control and exploitation. The article considers the impact of microelectronics on the process of centralization of capital, the aggravation of the problems of access to the sources of information and the forms of servicing in this field. Speaking against V. Leontief's theory of progressively "diminishing role" of labor and D. Bell's antitrade theory of value the author analyzes the radical qualitative revolution in the content and functions of labor caused by the Scientific and Technological revolution and its impact on the creation of value. The article notes the growing utilization of electronics for direct control over workers and office employees generating a new computer Taylorism. Speaking about the present and future impact of microelectronics on employment the author comes to the conclusion that this problem will further aggravate in the capitalist countries.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

CSO: 1816/2

ZAGLADIN ON BOURGEOIS, SOCIALIST REVOLUTIONS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 3-15

[Article by V. Zagladin: "First People's Revolution of the Age of Imperialism--passages between slantlines published in bold print, passages between double slantlines published in wide-spaced print]

[Excerpts] Every historical event can be examined from different points of view. It can be studied within the framework of the time when it occurred, and its premises, details and significance for contemporaries can be studied. But it is also possible to take a different approach, from the position of the contemporary age, taking into account the role which it played for further historical development, and taking into account not only its immediate but its far-reaching consequences and also the experience which it imparted to the movement of peoples along the road of social progress.

Such an approach is especially fruitful if what is involved is events which are boundaries or turning-points and which signal qualitative shifts in the history of society. The first Russian revolution of 1905-1907 was precisely this kind of event. The 80 years which have passed since then have convincingly confirmed that: "Expressing the general requirements of historical development, the 1905-1907 revolution in Russia was of great international significance."*

We shall attempt to look at this revolution through the eyes of our contemporary world and to evaluate its historical place and role in that mighty forward movement of the world revolutionary process of which the 20th century has become evidence.

In this article we shall confine ourselves merely to some aspects of the 1905-1907 revolution, and specifically to those to which Vladimir Ilich Lenin devoted particular attention. (passage omitted, describing Lenin's assessment of the 1905-1907 revolution. He wrote about its destabilizing effect on tsarism, the consolidation of the bourgeoisie as a class and the unmasking of its reactionary nature, the achievement of predominance in the revolutionary movement

* CPSU Central Committee Resolution "On the 80th Anniversary of the 1905-1907 Revolution in Russia," PRAVDA, 3 January 1985.

by the proletariat, and the new cohesion of working classes and nations of Russia. The revolution is likened to a rehearsal for both the 1917 revolutions and also the social and national liberation struggles of the same period in other parts of the world (Asia, Latin America, Western Europe). The revolution's importance in polarizing political factions is also mentioned.)

II

In socioeconomic content, the first revolution was a bourgeois revolution. "Our revolution," V.I. Lenin wrote, "is a bourgeois revolution because the struggle in it is not taking place between socialism and capitalism, but /between two forms of capitalism/, two paths of its development, two forms of bourgeois-democratic institutions."* In other words, the 1905-1907 revolution had to solve a task analogous to the tasks of any bourgeois revolution. However, it solved this task in its own unique way, and not as the Western European Revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries had done.

Examining the genesis of and nature of the first Russian revolution, V.I. Lenin once posed the question of whether a revolution of the 1784 type or of the 1848 type was involved. His answer was that a revolution of a quite new type was involved. And V.I. Lenin saw its main difference from its predecessors as lying in the fact that while the Russian revolution was bourgeois in its socioeconomic nature, it was popular and proletarian or proletarian-peasant in its motive force.

"A liberation movement which is bourgeois in socioeconomic content," V.I. Lenin wrote, "is not bourgeois in its motive forces. Not the bourgeoisie but the proletariat and peasantry can be its motive forces. Why is this possible? Because the proletariat and peasantry suffer more than the bourgeoisie from the vestiges of serfdom, and have a greater need for freedom and for the destruction of oppression by landowners. On the contrary, total victory threatens the bourgeoisie with the danger that the proletariat will use complete freedom against the bourgeoisie and the more complete the freedom and the more complete the destruction of the landowners' power, the more easily it will use this freedom.** (passage omitted, dealing with the 1905-1907 revolution as the first people's revolution of the new imperial stage of capitalism. This revolution involved both a national struggle for freedom and a class war between proletariat and bourgeoisie. The author describes the importance of the Russo-Japanese war as an external force affecting the revolution, the role of Bolsheviks in opposing this war and the spread of international solidarity and support for the revolution.)

We shall now attempt to examine the Leninist methodology of an approach to the question of why the first Russian revolution acquired such unique and profoundly progressive features.

In this regard, V.I. Lenin distinguishes an extraordinarily important methodological point in examining the problem of the motive forces of

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works", vol 17, p 167.

** Ibid., vol 15, p 206.

revolutions: A revolution may be of one kind (bourgeois) in objective content and different (proletarian-peasant) in its motive forces. Moreover, he comes out sharply against confusion of the general nature of a revolution in the sense of its socioeconomic content, with the question of the motive forces of revolution. "Marxists," he says, "cannot confuse these questions and cannot even /directly/ derive an answer to the second question from the answer to the first without particular concrete analysis.*

Such a divergence between the content of a revolution and its motive forces, Lenin stated, arise subject to the essence of the given age and to the nature, arrangement and correlation of internal and domestic and international class forces. The state of affairs within the specific country is of decisive importance. It is known that any revolution has its roots primarily in domestic conditions and is conditioned by the degree of acuteness of conflicts of social developments within the national framework. The arrangement and correlation of class forces in the international arena influence (to some extent) the actions of classes and parties within the given country and make it easier (or more difficult) for its revolutionary forces to solve the tasks facing them, although of course they are not capable of determining the course of events in a decisive manner. The external factor can never be a substitute for the domestic factors in the development of a revolution.

Proceeding from this, V.I. Lenin affirms that yes, a contradiction between the content of a revolution and the nature of its motive forces is possible, and at certain times also even natural. This contradiction, peculiar to the new age, was apparent for the first time (but not the last time!) in the 1905-1907 Russian revolution.

Thus, in an examination of the question of the typology of revolution it is necessary, in following Leninist methodology, to take account of both their socioeconomic content and the composition of their motive forces. Different combinations of the former and the latter may give rise to intermediate or transitional types of revolution which go beyond the bounds of the basic types of revolutionary processes or which change them in some respect.

In this connection we shall cite an extremely important idea which was expressed by V.I. Lenin during the years of the first Russian revolution and which convincingly substantiated the inevitability of transitional forms of revolution in the 20th century. "...In a concrete historical situation," he wrote, "elements of the past and future are interwoven and both of these roads become confused. Hired labor and its struggle against private ownership exists under an autocracy, too, and arises even under serfdom. But that does not in the least hinder us from logically and historically separating the major periods of development. After all, we all contrast bourgeois and socialist revolutions, we all insist unconditionally on the necessity of the most rigorous differentiation between them, so can it be denied that separate, /individual/ elements of the former and latter revolutions become interwoven in history? Does not the age of democratic revolutions in Europe know of a

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works", vol 17, p 386.

number of socialist movements and socialist attempts? And has not the future socialist revolution in Europe still have a great deal to complete in the sense of democracy?"*

Properly speaking, transitional or intermediate types of revolution are in fact the result of the "interweaving of elements of the past and the future" in each concrete revolutionary process. And this interweaving can be subject primarily to the nature of the given age, its motive forces, and the correlation of forces of the old and new orders.

The Leninist methodology of the approach to the question of the typology of revolutions provides the key to an understanding of the development of the revolutionary process and primarily to an understanding of those alterations which have occurred in the nature of evolutionary processes over the 20th century. These alterations have moved in precisely the direction predicted by V.I. Lenin on the basis of the first Russian revolution.

Let us cite a very typical example, that of the national liberation revolutions of the second half of the 20th century. As is known, K. Marx and F. Engels in their time and later, already in the age of imperialism, V.I. Lenin convincingly showed that in the age of premonopolist capitalism, national liberation movements were part of the general process of the formation of capitalist relations and were thus, as a rule, of a bourgeois or bourgeois-democratic nature. In the years 1789-1871, Lenin noted, there were numerous wars in Europe connected "...with powerful bourgeois-progressive national liberation movements which touched millions of people, and with the destruction of feudalism, absolutism, and foreign oppression."**

National liberation revolutions of the age of imperialism and especially of the age in which mankind started to move from capitalism to socialism, are a different matter. Taking into account (in accordance with the Marxist methodology developed by Lenin) the general nature of the new age*** particularly stressed that it is impossible to understand a single national liberation war without having understood the nature of the age in which it develops.**** Lenin said soon after the October Revolution: "...in the present world situation, after the imperialist war, the mutual relations of peoples and the entire world system of states are determined by the struggle of a small group of imperialist nations against the Soviet movement and the Soviet states, at the head of which stands Soviet Russia. /If we lose sight of this, we will not be able to pose a single national or colonial question correctly/ (my bold print--/V.Z./), even if it is the most remote corner of the world that is concerned."*****

At the beginning of the present century national liberation movements were already acquiring an anti-imperialist nature, that is to say, they were directed against imperialism (which, it is apposite to note, has been and continues to be the main obstacle on the way to liquidating precapitalist relations, too).

* V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works", p 74.

** Ibid., vol 27, p 101.

*** Ibid.

**** Ibid., vol 30, p 86.

***** Ibid., vol 41, p 242.

In the second half of the 20th century, when the workers class has become the leading social force, when the world socialist system has formed, and finally, when the destruction of the colonial empires has begun and rapidly ended, national liberation revolutions (even irrespective of their concrete content, which has been and will be diverse, and of their consequences, which are also far from homogeneous) form part of the general process of struggle between imperialism and anti-imperialist forces, that is, ultimately of the world revolutionary process of the contemporary period.*

All classes and social groups participated in the struggle for national liberation in the former colonial countries, because of which the struggle acquired a nationwide nature. However, in the new conditions (although the local bourgeoisie or bourgeois intelligentsia could be the leader of the anticolonial coalitions which carried out the revolution) the leading role was played by the popular masses, that is, the peasantry and (where it existed) the workers class. In this connection, the revolutionary forces of the former colonies acted in virtual alliance with, and with the support of, the international workers class, and primarily of the workers class of the countries where socialism had triumphed.

As a result, all national liberation revolutions of the postwar period were peoples' revolutions. And even in places where they developed under the virtual hegemony of the bourgeoisie their popular nature did not disappear.

In other words, the national liberation revolutions of our time, like the "old European revolutions" of the 16th to 18th centuries and the first half of the 19th century, initially passed through an all-national stage, but unlike the latter, possessed a potential opportunity for further development and for going beyond the democratic framework.** And the influence of the new age also had a telling effect in this.

In his day, V.I. Lenin said that if socialism has triumphed in a number of states, it is possible for economically backward countries, with the assistance of that socialism, to shift to socialism, avoiding (or interrupting) the capitalist stage of development.*** It stands to reason that such a possibility was not realized in all contemporary national liberation revolutions, but it theoretically existed in all cases. And this could not but leave its stamp on the course and features of their development.

The results of these revolutions were very different, as is known. Wherever a prolonged armed struggle was waged, in which an active role was played by a workers class which was perhaps small in numbers but which was active and which possessed its own revolutionary parties, development started along the road of people's democracy and of the revolution's subsequent growth into a socialist one.

* See K.N. Brutents, "Contemporary National Liberation Revolutions", Moscow, 1974, p 29.

** See R.A. Ulyanovskiy, Essays on National Liberation Struggle. Questions of Theory", Moscow, 1976, p 51.

*** V.I. Lenin, "Complete Collected Works", vol 41, pp 245-246.

In a number of cases--and these multiply as time passes--and specifically in those places where national liberations revolutions developed with revolutionary democracy playing a leading role, regimes of a socialist orientation arose which are already taking real steps along this road. What is essentially involved is a new phenomenon of our age, a new route toward socialism which is full of prospects for many countries and peoples.

In places where national liberation was implemented on the basis of a compromise with the former colonizers, development started, in many cases, along the road of establishing bourgeois orders. The opinion is sometimes expressed that in such cases one should talk about democratic revolutions of the old type, since they are, supposedly, expected to establish and sanctify bourgeois relations. In our view, it is difficult to agree with this in full.

Of course, a victorious local bourgeoisie has before set and now sets itself the task of ensuring its own dominating position and of leading former colonies down the road of precisely capitalist development. In the contemporary age, however, the bourgeoisie's behavior cannot be straightforward, either.

In examining contemporary national liberation movements as a sum total, it would be wrong to exaggerate the potential for social progress which is objectively inherent in them. As Ye.M. Primakov justly notes, it is impossible not to take account of the influence of the world capitalist economy on the liberated countries, which remain within the framework of this economy despite some or other progressive shifts in their development*

A process of social differentiation of society is now going on in the liberated countries. The workers class is gathering strength there and the peasantry is also changing. The evolution of the national bourgeoisie is continuing, too. New forms of cooperation between it and foreign corporations and particularly transnational corporations, cannot but have an influence on its political orientation. And even the middle-class bourgeoisie is to some extent also drawn into cooperation with foreign monopolist capital.

And although the anti-imperialist potential of the local bourgeoisie, both upper- and middle-class, is still far from being exhausted, it is being drawn increasingly into the sphere of competition and rivalry with foreign capital, and of the struggle for more advantageous conditions of cooperation with it. As far as the petit bourgeoisie is concerned, in many cases it still possesses anti-imperialist potential in the literal sense of the word.

The zigzags in the policy of some states arise from this. A certain instability of the revolutionary movement, and in some cases its incompleteness, have become a typical feature of many national liberation revolutions of the 20th century.

V.I. Lenin characterized the first Russian revolution as a people's revolution of the age of imperialism. We can now speak of a whole series of such revolutions, the people's revolutions of the age of the shift from capitalism to socialism on a world scale.

* See Ye.M. Primakov, "The East After the Collapse of the Colonial System", Moscow, 1982, p 30.

An analysis of the revolutionary movements (including national liberation movements) of the seventies which has been conducted by Soviet researchers shows that a popular nature is an inherent feature of all these revolutions. The decisive role of the popular masses--workers, peasants, the urban middle strata, artisans, students and other social groups--has been apparent in these revolutions, although with uneven force. The bourgeoisie, however, including the middle-class bourgeoisie, acted together with other democratic forces in only a few cases (and even then very inconsistently). In many countries it either occupied a counterrevolutionary position or remained neutral, tending toward a compromise with the old power or toward opposition to the new power.*

And it may be supposed that for the foreseeable future revolutions in the developing countries will also be popular revolutions.

In this connection, account should be taken of one consideration of considerable importance, which is of both a methodological and a terminological nature.

In characterizing revolutions of different types we employ different formulae, each of which has its own basis. When we speak, for example, about the basic types of revolution we use expressions which reflect their /socioeconomic content/: bourgeois or socialist revolution. Matters are different when what is involved is the characterization of revolutions of an intermediary or transitional type. Thus the term "people's revolution" reflects the revolutionary process not according to its socioeconomic content but /according to its motive forces/. The term "national liberation revolution" characterizes the corresponding revolutionary process /according to its immediate goals/.

All of this deserves further consideration and study. Account should evidently be taken of the fact that the same concepts can acquire different content in different ages.

Although the concept of "people's revolution" basically does characterize the given revolution according to its motive forces, another point is also obvious: In our age it acquires a much more profound meaning. What is clearly involved is a revolution which has a completely definite progressive /social content/. Thus, if the 1905-1907 revolution had ended in victory, this might have led to the appearance of a new type of power--a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry--and to the possible continuation of the revolution to socialism and a shift from bourgeois-democratic revolution to socialist revolution.

As far as the formula of "national liberation revolution" is concerned, in the first half of the 20th century it contains not only a characterization of the goals of revolution but also an indication of its ability to evolve as far as a transformation into a revolutionary-democratic and then also a socialist process.

* See B.I. Koval, "The Revolution Continues. The Experience of the Seventies", Moscow, 1984, pp 114-115.

In connection with Lenin's characterization of the 1905-1907 revolution, apart from those considerations which have already been expressed, others, too, suggest themselves. If there could and can be bourgeois revolutions of a new type, what can be said about socialist revolutions from this point of view? The question of the typology of socialist revolutions also requires consideration. In our age we have examples of socialist revolutions of different types. Indeed, there was the 1917 revolution in Russia. There were people's democratic and socialist revolutions in countries of Europe, Asia and America. The question of people's democratic revolutions as a specific type of socialist revolution has entered Marxist scientific literature.

It is generally known that up to now socialist revolutions have occurred mainly in countries with a medium level of development. Socialist revolutions in countries of this type will be inevitably in the future too, if, of course, there is a new arrangement of forces on both an international and a national scale. There will also be revolutions in countries with a high level of capitalist development. How will they take place? What will they give that is new to revolutionary experience?

The future will show this. But it is quite obvious that the elaboration of problems of the future strategy of social development and of the strategy and tactics of revolutionary parties are becoming particularly topical.

It stands to reason that in cases where socialist revolutions are involved it is equally necessary not to lose sight of the problem of the correlation of their socioeconomic content and motive forces.

It is quite that their content cannot be anything other than consistently socialist, although in the present age these revolutions have solved and will solve numerous tasks of the democratic nature too, which were not solved at previous stages of social development, the proportion of such tasks in the total volume of tasks of socialist revolution will evidently rise. In fact, the experience of the people's democratic revolutions of the postwar period has already demonstrated this.

As far as the motive forces of socialist revolutions are concerned there can be no doubt that the workers class has a special mission to fulfill. At the same time it is obvious that wider strata of the population will act in alliance with it than happened in the past, because the contemporary historical process will lead to socialist and democratic, primarily antimonopolist and anti-imperialist, tasks drawing closer together in the future.

Thus the contradiction which V.I. Lenin wrote about while discussing the 1905-1907 revolution does not arise. The contradiction was that this revolution, while bourgeois-democratic in content, was popular in its motive forces. Socialist revolutions, however, precisely because of their very nature, become /genuinely popular/ both in social content and in motive forces. This gives them (and will give them in the future) particular might and dynamism. But at the same time it will evidently give rise to additional difficulties. After all, the diversity of the participants in revolutions and their aspirations and interests will inevitably complicate the tasks of the leading force revolution, which is the workers class and its parties.

In these conditions there is an exceptional rise in the role already demonstrated by the experience of the October and subsequent socialist revolutions, of the consistently revolutionary Marxist-Leninist party, which is expected in its strategy and everyday activity to take account of and combine democratic and socialist requirements, subordinating the former to the latter and to rally all forces capable of carrying out a revolution into a united and powerful revolutionary army.

...When you turn to works by Lenin written during the period of the 1905-1907 revolution as well as to those which later analyze its experience, you immediately notice that the evaluations and conclusions formulated in them sound increasingly topical with the passage of time. This is not surprising, because on the one hand, the brilliant application and development by the leader of the Russian proletariat of the scientific Marxist methodology of studying social life cannot, for our time--a time of deep, diverse and sometimes paradoxically contradictory revolutionary changes--be anything other than a stimulating model and a source of powerful impetus for profound examination of these changes. On the other hand, many features and characteristics of the first Russian revolution which reflected a renewal of the content of the "usual", so to speak, traditional social processes--features and characteristics which V.I. Lenin examined in a bold and principled manner--have been and are manifest in numerous revolutionary events and movements in our time, too.

When you leaf through the works devoted to the 1905-1907 revolution which have appeared in recent years and which are based on increasingly full and profound study of primary sources, the conclusion becomes extremely clear that with the passage of time the sparks of this revolution are not dimming but, on the contrary, are becoming increasingly bright and noticeable, while its consequences are becoming increasingly significant. The indissolubility of 1905 and 1917 is today felt increasingly acutely, as is also the continuous link of the Russian revolutions with our time and with the revolutions and revolutionary movements of the end of the 20th century.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

CSO: 1816/2

WWII ANNIVERSARY ARTICLE HITS U.S.-JAPANESE SECURITY TIES

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 16-25

[Article by V. Bunin: "The Smashing of Japanese Militarism and Lessons of the Present Day"]

[Text] Two September 1985 was the 40th anniversary of the smashing of imperialist Japan--the last link of the fascist-militarist bloc. WWII lasted several months more following the surrender of Hitler Germany. Stubborn fighting was going on in the Far East, in the Pacific and in the Southeast Asian countries against the Japanese militarists, who had occupied this vast region. The biggest imperialist power in Asia, an active participant in the so-called Anti-Comintern Pact or Triple Alliance (also known as the Berlin--Rome--Tokyo Axis) continued desperate resistance.

Throughout the Great Patriotic War Japan maintained in a state of combat readiness on the Soviet Union's Far East borders a large strategic grouping of forces consisting of three fronts totaling (by the start of 1945) over 1 million men.* Their main strike force was the Kwantung Army. It had chalked up the treacherous attack on the MPR in the Halhin Gol River region in 1939 which had been coordinated for Anti-Comintern Pact purposes and which, as is known, culminated in the devastating rout of the aggressor by Soviet-Mongolian forces. After all, the plans of the Japanese military, which had been drawn up in Kwantung Army headquarters, provided for the occupation of the MPR, emergence at Lake Baykal and the Trans-Siberian Main Railroad and, in the event of success, the seizure even of a vast territory from Irkutsk to Vladivostok.

Imperialist aims and an endeavor to win world domination conditioned the decisive, offensive nature of Japan's military doctrines. Their extremely aggressive essence was revealed most fully by the so-called "Tanaka Memorial," which Gen Giichi Tanaka, prominent representative of the Japanese military, had sent to the emperor back on 15 July 1927. The memorandum set forth plans for Japan's seizure of Manchuria, Mongolia and China. "Having taken possession of all China's resources," the general wrote, "we will turn to conquering India and the countries of the South Seas and then to the conquest of Asia Minor, Central Asia and, finally, Europe." Large-scale aggression against the USSR was an integral part of these plans.

* "History of WWII 1939-1945," vol 11, Moscow, 1980, p 182.

The lessons of Halhin Gol sobered up Japan's ruling circles for a certain time. However, Tokyo continued to execute increasingly new strategic developments of military operations. Ultimately they formed the basis of the version prepared in the summer of 1941, which was entitled "Special Maneuvers of the Kwantung Army" and which became known as the ("Kantokuen") Plan. It was repeatedly reworked and specified subsequently, but realizing the intention of a new attack on the Soviet Union was not possible.

In actively preparing an invasion of USSR territory Japanese strategists timed it to coincide with the most suitable moment in the course of fascist Germany's war against the Soviet Union. However, they did not live to see it. The failure of their calculations was predetermined by the brilliant successes of the Red Army: the rout of the German-fascist forces at Moscow (1941), Stalingrad (1942) and Kursk (1943) and the series of devastating blows in 1944-1945, which had brought about a military-political situation on the Western Front which practically ruled out hopes for the success of Japan's aggressive aspirations.

On 9 August 1945 the USSR, true to its allied commitments assumed at the Crimea Conference, entered the war against Japan, which led to the liquidation of the dangerous militarist center in the Far East. As a result of the strategic operation of three fronts, the navy and the air force, which in terms of scale, dynamics and results occupies an outstanding place in the history of Soviet military art, the USSR Armed Forces quickly smashed the Kwantung Army. The threat of an attack on the Soviet Union was thereby removed, the security of its eastern borders was ensured (the USSR restored to itself primordial Russian land--South Sakhalin and the Kuriles) and Japan's hopes of waging a protracted war against the United States, Britain and China were finally destroyed.

On 2 September 1945 the Japanese Government signed the Act of Unconditional Surrender, which was the historically inevitable finale to the aggressive expansionist ambitions of Japanese imperialism. WWII, the bloodiest in history, which had cost more than 50 million human lives and had lasted 6 years, was over.

I

This year Soviet people and all progressive mankind are turning again and again to the events of the victorious 1945 in order once again to grasp the results and lessons of past battles and their influence on the postwar development of international relations. According to the unanimous evaluation made at that time by the statesmen of many countries, the heroism and energy of the Soviet people, who bore unheard-of burdens and emerged the victor in the antifascist war, deserved the admiration of the entire democratic world and enhanced extraordinarily the authority of the Soviet Union. And however the bourgeois falsifiers of history may excel in attempting to belittle the role of the USSR, they will hardly succeed in denying the undoubted fact that the main contribution to the achievement of victory over fascist Germany and, at the concluding stage of the war, over militarist Japan was made by the Soviet Union and its armed forces. At the same time the USSR does not belittle the combat merits and pays tribute to the martial exploits of the armed forces of the United States, Great Britain, China and other allied states in the smashing of the insidious enemy.

In respect of the military operations in the Far East even the bourgeois authors of many studies of the history of WWII which appeared in Japan on the eve and at the outset of the 1950's acknowledged that the allies' victory here "would have been inconceivable without the general liberation, antifascist struggle conducted by the peoples of all countries, primarily the peoples of the Soviet Union."*

The Soviet Army's rout of Japan's armed forces in the Far East was of world-historical significance. It changed fundamentally the alignment and correlation of forces in Asia in favor of peace, democracy and socialism and contributed to the deepening of the general crisis of the world capitalist system and a new upsurge of the national liberation movement. Most important events in the development of the world revolutionary process were the victories of the people's revolutions in Vietnam, North Korea and China and, later, in Laos and Cambodia.

In Japan itself conditions took shape for a certain democratization of political and social life, the complete liquidation of fascist and ultranationalist societies and the extirpation of the basis of militarist ideology. The Japanese Communist Party emerged from the underground, and the prerequisites arose for the creation and assertive activity of other democratic parties. Strong antiwar sentiments took root in the masses of the Japanese population, which had sobered up from the chauvinist intoxication and endured the atomic tragedies of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and a popular movement for the complete banning of atomic and hydrogen weapons arose.

On 3 May 1947 a new constitution came into force which, as a phenomenon unprecedented in the practice of bourgeois state law, included article 9, which proclaimed Japan's renunciation of war as the nation's sovereign right and also the threat of armed force or its use as a means of settling international disputes. The constitution did away with the legal basis of the restoration of militarism and laid the foundation for the country's development on a democratic basis.

However, the postwar changes in Asia, including the trends which had been discerned toward positive changes in Japan, were absolutely not to the liking of the imperialist powers, primarily the United States. From the first days the American occupation authorities, given the active support of local revanchist elements, did everything in order in violation of the Potsdam agreements to preserve the bases for a revival of Japan's armed forces. The first formations of the new Japanese Army in the guise of a "Police Reserve Corps" numbering 75,000 men were created on 8 July 1950 by a special directive of Gen D. MacArthur, commander in chief of the American occupation forces, in defiance of the constitutional prohibition. This directive increased the composition of the Maritime Security Directorate forces by 8,000 men. These first militarized detachments served as the basis for the "Self-Defense Force," which exists to this day.

* "History of the War in the Pacific" (translated from the Japanese), vol 5, Moscow, 1958, p 8.

The creation of the police formations coincided in time with the United States' unleashing of the aggressive war in Korea, when the system of American so-called "special orders," whose fulfillment contributed to the rapid restoration of Japan's military industry and enabled it later to switch to the production of arms for the needs of its own army, had begun to function. Within the framework of the "special orders" system Japanese industry produced and supplied the American forces conducting combat operations on the Korean peninsula and, in the 1960's-1970's, in Indochina also with everything necessary--from ammunition through individual equipment.

In the wake of the creation on 4 April 1949 in Europe of imperialism's major military-political bloc--NATO--Washington channeled efforts toward the formation of "peripheral" pacts and alliances. An object of its close attention was, in particular, the area of Asia and the Western Pacific, which made it possible to close a single chain of military bases and strategic beachheads extending along the borders of the USSR and the other socialist countries from Europe via the Near and Middle East and Southeast Asia right up to the Far East and the Pacific. For this purpose the United States concluded in the period 1951 through 1953 bilateral military alliances with Japan, South Korea and the Chiang Kai-shek clique on Taiwan and also with Thailand and the Philippines.

The Japanese-American "Security Treaty" (the Security Guarantee Treaty) was concluded simultaneously with the signing in San Francisco of the peace treaty with Japan on 8 September 1951. While a week earlier here representatives of the United States, Australia and New Zealand had appended their signatures to the so-called Pacific Security Pact (known as ANZUS). By the middle of the 1950's a whole number of new military blocs--CENTO, SEATO and others--had arisen in Asia.

As "compensation" for the granting to Japan of the United States' "nuclear cover" the Japanese-American "Security Treaty" officially enshrined the deployment on its territory of American forces and bases and was the legal basis for the future military-political alliance which took shape on the basis of the community of class interests of the Japanese and American monopoly bourgeoisie in the struggle against the democratic forces of Japan, the socialist countries and the national liberation movement in the region.

Quite recently the Japanese public angrily learned about the contents of declassified documents (made public on 22 May 1985 by the U.S. State Department) concerning American foreign policy in respect of Japan and China. They indicate, *inter alia*, that back in 1954 the H. Truman administration had concluded with the S. Yoshida government a secret agreement on the creation in the event of "special circumstances" of a joint grouping of Japanese-American forces under the overall command of U.S. Army headquarters. AKAHATA, the organ of Japan's communists, noted in connection with this publication that had the content of the agreement become known to the Japanese people at the time, "the liberal democrats would undoubtedly have been defeated at the general election."*

* AKAHATA, 24 May 1985.

The treaty stimulated the revival of the country's military power inasmuch as it expressed Washington's hopes that "Japan itself will increasingly assume responsibility for its own defense against direct and indirect aggression." This corresponded fully to the cherished aspirations of Japanese monopoly capital, which hoped with U.S. help to gradually restore the army, equip it with the latest types of arms and thus achieve military independence of the Pentagon to a certain extent. Later, endeavoring to secure for themselves stronger positions within the framework of the military-political alliance with the United States, the country's ruling circles sought a revision of the 1951 treaty.

The new version of the "Security Treaty" was signed in Washington on 19 January 1960 (Mutual Cooperation and Security Treaty). It now proceeded from the existence of a Japanese regular army, which had officially taken shape by that time and which was disguised by the "Self-Defense Force". According to article 3 of the treaty, Japan undertook to continue "to maintain and develop in accordance with its constitutional provisions" its own military potential. The treaty actually made it incumbent upon Japan to participate in U.S. military strategy and "engage in actions to remove a common danger" which threatens the "peace and security of each side" (article 5 of the treaty). It ensued from the content of the treaty that Japan could find itself willy-nilly involved in any military conflict unleashed by Washington in the Far East.

A ramified network of various Japanese-American committees and joint bodies was created to coordinate the sides' positions in respect of realization of the "Security Treaty," whose wording enabled both sides to interpret articles of the treaty arbitrarily and thereby considerably expand its framework. Thus a consultative committee for an exchange of opinions on the biggest problems of military cooperation between the countries was instituted on 19 January 1960. For the coordination of specific questions a decision was adopted in 1968 on the holding of regular meetings at working level. Annual meetings of leaders of the military departments of Japan and the United States have been organized since 1975.

The "Guiding Principles of Japanese-American Cooperation on Defense Issues," which were approved by the above-mentioned consultative committee and adopted by the Japanese Cabinet on 28 November 1978, were a logical continuation and development of the "Security Treaty". In accordance with these "principles," Japan associated itself actively with participation together with the United States in preparations for combat operations on the country's territory and in the region and with the creation of coordination bodies for a special period, the collection and exchange with the Pentagon of intelligence information and the organization of a uniform material-technical supply system which would make it possible to expand the sphere and duration of autonomous activity of the Maritime "Self-Defense Force" on the open seas. The development of bilateral combat operations in the event of a complication of the situation in the Far East and also aggressive plans to blockade the international La Perouse, (Sangar) and Korea straits for the purpose of closing off outlets for ships of the Soviet Pacific Fleet into the open seas is under way.

The preparation of such actions in peacetime signifies, first, Japan's association with a "collective defense" system, which its laws prohibit, second, a display of hostility in respect of a neighboring state--the Soviet Union--which is declared "enemy No 1," and, third, represents not only a flagrant flouting of Japan's constitution but also the international law of the sea, which is designed to ensure freedom of navigation in international waters.

Justifying Japan's participation in the plans to blockade international straits, Adm Ts. Yata, chairman of Japan's Joint Chiefs of Staff Committee, wrote in the military-theoretical journal (KOKUBO): "What is most acceptable for joint operations under the conditions of the Japanese-American security system? Both adult and child are well aware of the 'give-and-take' principle. We take from America its combat power (that is, Japan's "cover" in the form of the American "nuclear umbrella"--V.B.), but what are we giving in exchange? In this sense blockade of the three straits, besides its importance for the security of Japan proper, could serve as our small compensation for the United States' generous handout.* In other words, the Japanese admiral is attempting to portray such a large-scale military-strategic measure as, say, the mining of international waters merely as Tokyo's modest "tribute" to Washington.

The main thing, however, about which, naturally, the admiral remains silent, consists under the cover of "protecting supply lines" of an appreciable increase in naval and air forces and the movement of the armed forces, in defiance of the existing constitutional prohibitions, beyond a national framework to a regional level, that is, legalization of the dispatch of the "Self-Defense Force" overseas.

What, however, are the true parameters of Japan's contribution to the buildup of imperialism's overall military power--in the global and regional aspects?

II

Pentagon strategists have in recent years begun to pay higher-than-usual attention to the Asia-Pacific region, a key role in which is assigned the "land of the rising sun." With the consent and support of the Y. Nakasone government the U.S. Administration has been elaborating in detail a strategy of "power confrontation" providing for the unification and coordination of the efforts of the three imperialist "power centers"--the United States, West Europe and Japan--for the achievement of military superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist countries.

Describing the Asia-Pacific strategy of the U.S. Administration, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, observed that the United States "is encouraging revanchist trends in the policy of Japan's ruling circles and speeding up the cobbling together of the Washington--Tokyo--Seoul militarist alliance. Washington is endeavoring to associate the countries of the region with realization of its global military-political plans, including the notorious 'Pacific doctrine,' interfere in the affairs of sovereign peoples and impede a solution of the problem by way of negotiation."

* (KOKUBO) No 4, 1980, p 24.

In turn, Japan's ruling circles, particularly since the assumption of office by Prime Minister Y. Nakasone, are supporting Washington's aggressive global policy increasingly actively. Evidently having forgotten the lessons of recent history, they are ignoring the decisions of the Yalta and Potsdam conferences and violating the laws of their own country, which is expressed in propaganda of anti-Soviet revanchist sentiments of unprecedented scale, the advancement of unjustified territorial claims against the Soviet Union, an increase in military spending and the acceleration of programs of military organizational development.

The question arises: does Tokyo, which is deliberately distorting Soviet foreign policy and speculating on the myth of the "Soviet military threat" which has been imposed by Washington, seriously believe the trans-Pacific inventions to the effect that the Soviet Union is preparing to attack the Japanese islands? The facts show that the country's ruling circles needed the notorious "myth" to cover and justify costly military preparations and prepare public opinion for the prospect of an even more intensive buildup of the combat power of the country's armed forces.

While having proclaimed the renunciation "for all time" of war and arms, even now Japan is in terms of military spending growth rate (an annual 6.5-7 percent) doubly outstripping the corresponding indicators of the West European NATO countries. The absolute level of direct spending on the army in the 1985-1986 fiscal year will for the first time amount to 3 trillion yen (\$13 billion) and, as specialists believe, will exceed the official "political ceiling," according to which military appropriations must not be in excess of 1 percent of the country's GNP. However, actual spending, if the calculation is made according to the "NATO formula," constitutes 1.5 percent of GNP. Washington, however, is seeking from Tokyo an increase in the spending on the army to the level of the NATO countries, that is, 3 percent of GNP.

In the less than four decades since the rout of Japanese militarism the "Self-Defense Force" has become a real regular army, which in terms of total power is in fifth-sixth place among all the capitalist countries and first place in Asia, exceeding dozens of times over the combat capability of the former imperial army of the WWII period. In terms of the number of divisions the "Self-Defense Force" is equal to the West German Bundeswehr, while in terms of the numbers of ground forces it is only slightly inferior to the British Army. The ASW and minesweeping possibilities of Japan's navy are greater than those of the navies of many West European NATO countries. In terms of the number of P-3C naval patrol aircraft and F-15 fighter-interceptors Japan is by 1987 to have overtaken all the capitalist states except the United States.

The "Self-Defense Force" is equipped with the most modern arms. Japan's military industry has assimilated the manufacture of all types of combat equipment and provides the "Self-Defense Force" with more than 90 percent thereof. Japan occupies leading positions in the development and adoption in production of many types of the most complex military technology, which has become a subject of the Pentagon's particular interest. In 1983 the Y. Nakasone government, in breach of parliamentary resolutions prohibiting arms and military technology exports, agreed to pass on to the United States production secrets in the sphere of microcomputer equipment, fiber optics, lasers and heat-resistant coverings, which are used in the creation of ballistic missiles and AMB systems. Agreement was also reached on the joint development and manufacture of certain types of arms.

The organizational development of the Japanese Army is being carried out on the basis of 5-year programs. Realization of the sixth program is being completed currently. The draft seventh program, which is geared to the period 1986-1990, was adopted in May 1984.

The developed version of the new program of military organizational development, which took account of the latest military-political doctrines and demands of the U.S. Administration, was communicated in June 1985 to the leaders of the U.S. Defense Department during a visit to Washington by K. Kato, chief of the National Defense Agency. Japan's democratic press called his negotiations with Pentagon generals a "dangerous conspiracy," paying particular attention to the fact that Kato promised to provide for the combat patrolling of the entire air space extending over a 1,000-mile ocean expanse.* This new commitment of Japan's, which brought about the justified criticism of the opposition parties, was confirmed in parliament on 20 June 1985 by Prime Minister Y. Nakasone also.

The readiness in principle of Japan's ruling circles to associate the country with the militarist policy of the NATO bloc also represents a great danger for the cause of peace. Delivering a speech in parliament on 24 January 1983, Foreign Minister S. Abe declared that Japan's close cooperation with the NATO countries was an indispensable condition for the cohesion and unity of the Western camp. "In this plane," the minister said, "Japan would like to develop relations in the sphere of industrial, scientific, technical and also political (read: military-political--V.B.) cooperation."**

The visits of leaders of Japan's military department to NATO Headquarters have become regular recently. A broad range of problems is discussed there, from an exchange of the latest techniques of the production of the main types of arms for the purpose of their standardization through questions of "comprehensive support of Western security". A series of meetings was held in April 1983 in Tokyo at foreign minister level with official delegations of a number of NATO countries (the United States, Great Britain and France) which settled specific questions of military-political cooperation. At the start of July of the same year consultations were held here of delegations of members of parliament of NATO countries and members of the Japanese so-called Parliamentary Union for Comprehensive Support of the Security of Japan, the United States and West Europe. The main attention at the talks was paid to the deployment of the American intermediate-range nuclear missiles not only in West Europe but in East Asia and also to the participation of the United States' allies in economic "sanctions" against the Soviet Union.

A particular place in Japan's foreign policy is occupied by efforts aimed at the expansion of military relations with the South Korean regime. This policy, which closely links questions of ensuring the country's "security" with South Korea's "defense measures," corresponds to the strategy of Washington, which attaches importance to the buildup of combat power, nuclear included, in the south of the Korean peninsula, considering it, together with Japan, a principal outpost for realization of its aggressive aspirations.

* (SHAKAI SHIMPO), 14 June 1985.

** THE DAILY YOMIURI, 25 January 1983.

The content of the top-secret "Three Arrows" plan, which had been developed by the National Defense Agency (NDA) for the contingency of a military conflict on the Korean peninsula and which was made public in February 1965, in particular, testifies to the long-standing and close coordination of the military measures of Japan and South Korea. The plan, which symbolized the military alliance of the "three combat arrows" (the United States--Japan--South Korea), provided for the joint operations of American, South Korean and Japanese forces, the nuclear bombing of industrial and strategic centers of the USSR and China, occupation of the Kuriles and Sakhalin and also the general mobilization of Japan's material and human resources and suspension of all its citizens' democratic rights.*

One further secret document (which had been prepared by the command-staff college of Japan's ground forces back in June 1959)--the report "Combat Operations for the Country's Defense"--which was made public in parliament on 12 March 1985 by K. (Ueda), a member from the Japanese CP, testified to bloc coordination. As follows from its contents, at a time of complication of the military-political situation in the Far East 13 states and regimes, including the United States, Japan, South Korea, the Philippines, Taiwan, Australia and others, would conclude a Pacific defense pact, and their armed forces would be incorporated in a joint army under general American command.**

The Japanese ruling circles' special interest in the stable position of the Chun Doo Hwan South Korean puppet regime is expressed in an endeavor to strengthen military cooperation with it even more. Visits by Y. Nakasone to Seoul in January 1983, when he consented to grant South Korea a loan of \$4 billion, and by Chun Doo Hwan to Tokyo at the start of September 1984 contributed to this purpose. While the head of the Seoul regime was conducting negotiations at the top level three representatives of the army leadership who had been included in his strong retinue were conducting a series of negotiations with the NDA's leaders.

They dealt with the acquisition of the latest Japanese "dual purpose" technology which could be used to modernize the South Korean Army and with obtaining from Tokyo somewhat more in the way of financial resources. As is known, Seoul spends on military needs approximately 6 percent of its GNP and could not without sizable subsidies from Washington and Tokyo (in the form of economic assistance) maintain a 600,000-man army.

The reciprocal visits of statesmen and military figures of the United States, Japan and South Korea, which have become more frequent recently, testify to a persistent endeavor to create in this region a new strategic infrastructure as an integral part of imperialism's overall system of aggressive military blocs. A dangerous trend has actually appeared toward the cobbling together in the Far East under the U.S. aegis of the new Washington--Tokyo--Seoul NATO-type military-political alliance, which many Western military observers are rightly identifying with the notorious Berlin--Rome--Tokyo Axis. An endeavor by Washington officials to associate with this new anti-Soviet bloc other states of the region also, particularly certain ASEAN countries, may be discerned.

* "Khankiti toso-no dzensin-no tameni" ("For Stimulation of the Struggle Against the Bases"), Yokohama, 1978, p 40.

** See AKAHATA, 13 March 1985.

As the speeches of Soviet leaders have emphasized, the Asian continent is becoming one more, eastern, front of the struggle against the socialist countries.

III

Over 300 American bases and facilities, more than one-third of which (119) in Japan, are located on the Asian continent and the Pacific islands. U.S. military experts claim that all the Pentagon's facilities on Japanese soil are a part of the United States' "forward defense" system and are associated with preparations for global nuclear war or regional conflicts with the use of weapons of mass annihilation. According to foreign press data, the quantitative composition of American forces in the Western Pacific has increased by 30,000 in recent years and now constitutes approximately 190,000 soldiers and officers.

According to calculations of Western specialists, the army of a potential (actually existing, but not legally officialized) "eastern" bloc--the Far East branch of NATO--numbers even now more than 1 million men (including the 250,000 in the Japanese "Self-Defense Force"), 2,000 tanks (over half of which are accounted for by Japan), approximately 2,000 aircraft and 400 warships of various classes (160 of them within the "Self-Defense Force").

The Pentagon's plans to bring its armed forces in the Far East, including intermediate-range nuclear missiles, closer (for the purpose of increasing the surprise factor of an attack) to the territory of the Soviet Union call attention to themselves. The furnishing of ships of the U.S. 7th Fleet, whose headquarters are located at the Japanese Yokosuka naval base, with Tomahawk cruise missiles is proceeding apace. Their total number, as the foreign press reports, is to amount to 375, and conventional warheads will gradually be replaced by nuclear warheads. In 1985 the Misawa air base, which is located in the northeast of the biggest Japanese island of Honshu, became, with the approval of the country's government, the location of the deployment of American F-16 fighter-bomber squadrons (50 aircraft) capable of carrying nuclear weapons and targeted, which is concealed neither in Tokyo nor Washington, against the Soviet Union. Preparations are under way in South Korea for installation of the Pershing 2 intermediate-range missiles and ground-based cruise missiles. The possibility of the appearance of such weapons on Japanese soil also cannot be ruled out. A special U.S. Defense Department report cites as possible points for the deployment of ground-based cruise missiles the Misawa and Sasebo bases and also the Shiretoko peninsula in the east of Hokkaido and the Oga peninsula in the north of Honshu.

All these measures serve the Pentagon's main goal--changing the military-strategic balance which has evolved in the Far East in its favor.

Tokyo officials are declaring constantly that Japan's military policy will be exercised within the framework of the constitution and will invariably abide by the three nonnuclear principles--not to produce, not to have and not allow nuclear weapons on its territory. In practice, however, representatives of the Japanese Government are confining themselves merely to rhetorical statements concerning a love of peace while simultaneously speeding up military preparations. Efforts are being made openly for a revision of the constitution for the purpose

of removing its antiwar article 9. The actions of Japan's ruling circles, who have sanctioned calls at Japanese ports of U.S. 7th Fleet ships carrying nuclear weapons, can hardly be called consistent and in accord with the nonnuclear principles.

The inconsistency of official Tokyo's policy is also manifested in Japan's position in the United Nations, where its representative has voted against a number of important Soviet proposals on disarmament issues, including a resolution condemning nuclear war and on a nuclear arms freeze. Japan also passed over in silence the Soviet Union's initiative on the conclusion of an agreement on guarantees, that is, the enshrinement in appropriate treaty form of the USSR's undertaking not to use nuclear weapons against Japan in response to the Japanese side's confirmation of strict and consistent observance of its nuclear-free status.

Adoption of the Soviet proposal on negotiations on confidence-building measures in the Far East with the participation of other interested states and the Soviet initiatives aimed at limiting naval operations and the extension of confidence-building measures to the seas and oceans, particularly the areas across which busy sea lanes run, could contribute to a large extent to a stabilization of the situation in the Pacific.

However, in response Japan's ruling circles, as if having forgotten the lessons of the past war, are declaring, following Washington's example, a "sphere of their vital interests" a vast ocean region from Tokyo right up to Guam, which is 1,300 miles away from the shores of the Japanese archipelago. Tokyo is stepping up realization of the idea of the creation of a so-called "Pacific Community," to which it is intended in the future imparting a military thrust and incorporating in the infrastructure of an anti-Soviet, antisocialist "eastern front".

More than four decades have elapsed since the day when under the blows of the Soviet Army in the Far East the final link of the fascist-militarist bloc which had unleashed WWII--imperial Japan--collapsed. Now Japanese imperialism, which is linked to Washington by a military alliance and is engaged in accelerated militarization, is supporting the adventurist global and regional plans of the United States for knocking together a new anti-Soviet alliance in East Asia and the Western Pacific, which cannot fail to be reflected negatively in the state of Japanese-Soviet relations.

The Soviet Union consistently advocates, without time being lost, the start of an active, good-neighborly search for ways of improving the situation on the Asian continent. As M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in conversation with Y. Nakasone in March 1985, the USSR "is prepared to develop mutually profitable relations with Japan in various spheres and advocates that a good-neighbor nature be imparted to relations between the two countries." The importance of the removal of the difficulties and restrictions in the way of the development of relations between the two countries which are being artificially created by the Japanese side and the Japanese leadership's pursuit not in word but in deed of a peace-loving policy was emphasized also.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

U.S., ALLIES' ROLE IN WORLD ARMS TRADE

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 26-37

[Article by S. Blagovolin: "Expansion of the Military-Industrial Complexes in the International Arena"]

[Text] A most dangerous manifestation for the cause of peace of the growing role of imperialist states' military-industrial complexes [MIC] is the progressive expansion of their activity outside of the United States and the other members of the aggressive NATO bloc. This process is being further stimulated under conditions where the policy of imperialism, American primarily, is assuming an openly militarist nature.

The military-power component is performing a markedly growing role both in the system of views and in the practice of the ruling circles of the United States and other capitalist states. For this reason the activity of the military-industrial complex has in recent years reflected to the greatest extent the general content and direction of their policy line and represented a most important component of the latter.

I

Upon an analysis of the causes and conditions of the expansion of the sphere of activity of the MIC of the leading capitalist countries since WWII it is essential, of course, to also take account of regularities inherent in imperialism like the exacerbation of interimperialist contradictions, the struggle for sales markets and spheres of capital investment and so forth. Under the impact of these factors the MIC are by virtue of the very nature of monopoly capitalism expanding beyond national borders, and it is they which to a considerable extent are determining the scale and directions of the activity of the MIC in the international arena.

However, under current conditions the aspiration of the ruling circles of the United States and its allies to a sharp increase in the aggregate military might of imperialism and the creation of a military-political and military-economic structure which will correspond to long-term strategic goals in the struggle against the USSR and the entire socialist community and also the national liberation movements in various parts of the world is becoming the main driving force of the expansion of the sphere of activity of the MIC of the leading capitalist states and its globalization.

The efforts being made in this direction are aimed at the extensive use of the growing economic and military-political possibilities of states which are not a part of NATO, the formation in them of sufficiently influential forces concerned for the development of long-term cooperation with the imperialist powers and securing for the United States and its NATO allies guaranteed access to sources of raw material. An important part in the expansion of the MIC beyond national borders is also played by such considerations as the expansion of sales markets not only for military products but also an extensive list of other products frequently produced by the same Western military-industrial firms; and an increase in the profitability of military production achieved by way of an increase in series manufacture and the shifting of part of the expenditure on the creation of new models of arms and military equipment onto the states acquiring large consignments of the latest arms and also thanks to the use of cheaper manpower in "third" countries for the manufacture of this type of armament and military equipment or the other or individual components and units.

It has to be emphasized that in enlisting various countries in the sphere of their influence the MIC of the imperialist states aspire to the creation in them of a domestic policy situation which would ensure as stable a pro-West, anti-Soviet orientation of these countries as possible. Characterizing the international aspects of the activity of the U.S. military-industrial complex, the French journal *LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE* wrote back in 1977: "It is a question of an entirely new phenomenon--of the transfer not only of the products themselves but of the entire system of relations which are currently associated with the expression 'military-industrial complex'. The point being that in entering into cooperation with foreign states... the large-scale military firm inevitably reproduces abroad the same outline of political, military and economic collusion which has today become a distinguishing feature of the American way of life."*

Of course, it is far from always that the acquisition by this country or the other which is not a member of NATO or other aggressive blocs of Western weapons or their production techniques leads to its involvement in the sphere of influence of the United States and its allies. India, for example, purchases a considerable proportion of the arms it needs from capitalist states and also resorts to cooperation with Western companies for the development of its own military industry. However, despite the quite broad scale of such relations (particularly with British and French firms), India pursues an independent foreign policy course with a clearly expressed anti-imperialist and antimilitarist thrust.

The expansion of the NATO countries' MIC beyond this bloc is a relatively new phenomenon. Of course, the imperialist powers aspired earlier also to the enlistment of states not in the North Atlantic alliance in the sphere of their influence. However, the efforts made in this direction in the 1950's-1960's were essentially limited to conclusion with them of intergovernmental agreements, the rendering of military "assistance," the creation of military

* *LE MONDE DIPLOMATIQUE*, February 1977, p 4.

facilities on their territory and so forth. These states' purchases of weapons and military equipment in the NATO countries as a whole were small (corresponding expenditure by the start of the 1970's constituted approximately \$1 billion annually), the economic and technical base for independent arms production practically did not exist and in a number of cases more extensive military interaction with the NATO countries was held back by political factors (as was the case in Japan).

The situation changed sharply throughout the 1970's. The economic and, consequently, the military-economic possibilities of a significant number of countries outside of NATO grew many times over. Furthermore, by virtue of various circumstances (among which an important place is occupied by economic and political pressure on the part of the United States, unsolved regional problems and also a pro-imperialist foreign policy course), some of these states began to display growing assertiveness in the military and military-economic spheres. Military spending is growing rapidly, purchases of the latest arms and military equipment are increasing and a national military industry is being created also.

On the other hand, use of the possibilities of states which are not a part of NATO is becoming for imperialism not only desirable but also essential under the conditions of the new round of the arms race initiated by the United States and its closest allies and the unprecedented quantitative and qualitative buildup of military might, which is demanding huge additional material, human, financial and other resources.

This combination of "supply" and "demand" has created in a number of countries and territories which are not members of the North Atlantic alliance the basis for a certain strengthening of the positions of the economic and political groupings connected with military business or the policy of cooperation in the military sphere with the imperialist states. Among them are primarily Israel, South Africa, South Korea, Pakistan, Taiwan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt and the ASEAN states and also Brazil, Australia and Japan, which occupies a completely special position. All the above countries and territories are characterized by a quite high level of military spending (see table), they purchase the bulk of the arms sold by the United States and the other NATO members and they maintain close political relations with Washington and its allies.

Of course, there are considerable differences both politically and economically between individual states within this group. Whereas, for example, Japan pertains to the number of "privileged" partners of the United States, participates increasingly actively in the pursuit of imperialist foreign policy and possesses tremendous economic and scientific-technical potential, Israel, Taiwan, South Korea and South Africa are entirely dependent on the support of Washington and its NATO allies. Whereas the United States has established stable mutual relations in the military-political sphere with Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, relations in this sphere are taking shape in a highly complex and contradictory fashion with Egypt, Brazil and certain ASEAN countries. Finally, whereas some states, Israel, say, not to mention Japan and Brazil, already have a quite developed military industry, in others, Egypt and Indonesia, for example, they are at the formation stage, while yet others such as Pakistan and the Philippines are only just starting to create such.

Basic Indicators Characterizing the Military-Economic Development of a Number of States and Territories Outside of NATO

	Military Spending (\$, Millions)*				GNP (\$, Billions)*		
	1960	1970	1980	1984	1960	1970	1983
Israel	163.1	1,075	5,200	8,242***	2	5.4	24
South Africa	61.6	359.9	2,560	2,940	7.4	17.6	76.6
South Korea	227.1	333	3,460	4,315	3.8	8.3	76.6
Taiwan	203.3	482.5	3,200	3,574	--	5.5	49.8
Pakistan	205	625	1,180	1,873	7.7	16	30.9
Saudi Arabia	50	387	20,700	21,952	1.9**	4.1	119.9
Egypt	225.9	1,272	2,170	3,043	3.3	6.4	31.8
Thailand	65.2	235	1,090	3,927***	2.5	6.1	40.4
Malaysia	42.9	260	1,470	2,170	1.9	4.0	29.1
Philippines	87.1	139	764	601.3	6.7	5.9	34.3
Indonesia	484.8	272	2,070	2,527	7.5	11.6	73.3
Singapore	8.0	106.5	574	1,075	.7	1.8	15.1
Brazil	567.3	599.7	1,540	1,838***	14.5	40.1	241.0***
Australia	419	1,261	3,900	4,945	14.4	34.4	159.4
Japan	455.9	1,582	8,960	12,488	43.1	195	1,178.9

* Current Prices. ** 1963. *** 1982.

Sources: "World Armaments and Disarmament. SIPRI Yearbook 1972," Stockholm, 1972, pp 86, 90, 92; "The Military Balance" for the appropriate years; "Yearbook of National Accounts Statistics, 1980," vol II, New York, 1982.

As we can see, the overall picture appears very varied, which cannot fail to influence the conditions and possibilities of the activity of the MIC in different countries. This activity, which serves the goals of imperialist policy regionally and globally, is not isolated from interstate relations, within the framework of which diverse channels and lines of communication are used for enlisting this state or the other in the sphere of the NATO bloc's military-political influence. However, the expansion of the imperialist powers' MIC in the international arena as its proportions extend is becoming an increasingly powerful lever of economic and political influence on these states of largely independent significance. Thus the role of the MIC may in a number of cases even appear to exist independently of interstate relations. But essentially it is precisely with the active participation of the MIC that the structures of diverse and stable interconnections between the NATO countries and states which are not a part of this organization in the military and military-economic spheres are being created.

II

Expansion of the sphere of influence of the MIC of the United States and its allies would be impossible without the existence of a developed military industry, the bounds of whose activity currently go far beyond the framework of the creation and production merely of arms and military equipment, encompassing a considerable proportion of related sectors and also the sphere of military R&D.

Besides the United States, the West European NATO countries and, in the future, Japan have the potential for the production of arms and equipment on a large scale. However, there is one very important difference between them. While Japan is beginning to develop arms production by relying on its own potential, albeit enlisting American technology for this purpose, the West European countries were able to create their military-industrial potential in the process of the expansion and intensification of military-technical and military-industrial integration. This is a fundamental singularity of the development of the military industry of NATO's West European region. It is important to note that whereas earlier the integration process developed basically in aviation-missile industry (which was connected with the particular complexity, cost and science-intensiveness of its product*), in recent years it has to an increasingly large extent embraced other military-oriented sectors also.

Thus the structure of the aggregate power created by the imperialist countries is based on two main centers of military production--the United States and West Europe--with the prospective appearance in the relatively near future of a third center--Japan.

It should also be considered that the United States, West Europe and Japan are as a whole entirely comparable among themselves in terms of the technical level of the manufactured product, labor productivity and other important indicators. There are large-scale military-industrial concerns everywhere. Therefore as the military industry in West Europe and Japan comes into being and develops the U.S. monopolies may, where necessary, concentrate their efforts on the development of the latest types of arms and equipment embodying the latest achievements of science and technology and corresponding to the demands made of them by American military doctrine. The development, however, of arms and military equipment intended primarily for tackling relatively narrow, "regional" tasks is being shifted if only partially to the allies. And, furthermore, this "division of labor" is being practiced in the creation not only of strategic nuclear weapons, electronic and space monitoring, command and control systems, certain types of surface ships and submarines, strategic mobility support means and ABM systems but also such traditional types of arms as, for example, tanks.**

Reagan's notorious Strategic Defense Initiative, toward whose realization Washington is trying to dispose the allies with might and main, may serve as a graphic example of the endeavor of the U.S. MIC to use other countries as kinds of Pentagon subcontractors. It is being proposed here that each country "invited" to participate in the "star wars" program undertake the development of individual components of an ABM system based, as a rule, on more or less known technology. The development of fundamentally new elements, however, Washington intends reserving for American companies. It is not fortuitous that certain West European states, particularly France, have already turned down the American "invitation," while others are manifestly in no hurry to respond, fearing that such an allocation of roles will enshrine West Europe's technology lag behind the United States.

* See "West Europe in the Modern World," vol 1, Moscow, 1979, p 254.

** See INTERNATIONAL DEFENSE REVIEW No 12, 1981, p 1658; ARMOR, November-December, 1982, p 24.

A most important result of the expansion of the sphere of activity of the MIC is the rapid growth of the number of countries with a more or less developed military industry capable of producing certain types of arms and equipment and, what is more, undertaking their servicing and provision with spares. Even a decade ago states allied with the United States outside of NATO, not counting Japan, essentially lacked such possibilities.

To judge by everything, the creation of peripheral production components capable of catering for part of the arms, equipment and spares need will continue at quite a rapid pace, encompassing also states which even recently practically lacked a military industry altogether. Egypt, where the volume of military production in the period 1979-1982 alone increased almost tenfold, may serve as an example.* An intensive process of the creation of a modern military industry has also begun in certain other Arab countries connected with the United States and NATO, in Pakistan and in a number of ASEAN states.**

The national military industry here is capable of catering entirely for the production merely of such types of product as ammunition, artillery arms, antitank missiles, certain models of armored equipment, small surface ships and helicopters.

As far as the production in these countries of products distinguished by the greatest complexity like, for example, combat aircraft, air defense missile complexes and so forth is concerned, however, it is connected, as a rule, with supplies from the United States and other NATO members of many basic components and units. Specialization in the manufacture of individual components combined with supplies on a cooperative basis of parts and components which are complex in the technical and production respects corresponds to these countries' actual possibilities in the military-economic sphere. Joint production may, as experience shows, be oriented toward the growth of such possibilities with the progressive substitution for cooperative supplies of national products. This practice, besides the political and economic calculations and advantages for the MIC of the imperialist states connected therewith, essentially also serves as a kind of guarantee against the "new boys'" capture of the bulk of the arms market controlled by the NATO countries' MIC.

Characteristic from this viewpoint is the example of South Korea, where the volume of the manufacture of military industry products in the past 4 years doubled and where now approximately 75-80 percent of the personal equipment needed for the South Korean armed forces is produced independently--with the use, of course, of American licenses and joint production agreements. Exports from South Korea of relatively simple and cheap types of arms and military equipment, the value of which at the start of the current decade constituted approximately \$250 million a year, are also growing simultaneously.

* EIGHT DAYS, 13 February 1982.

** See INTERAVIA No 2, 1983, pp 136-138; INTERNATIONAL DEFENSE REVIEW, No 11, 1983, p 1572.

The MIC are also operating actively in the sphere of the use of the base sectors of industry for ensuring the functioning of military production. Big efforts are being made in the United States and other NATO countries aimed at strengthening and expanding the general economic base of military production. As a whole, the leading capitalist states have quite developed base sectors of industry. At the same time, however, they also have bottlenecks, which gives rise to the need for supplies from other countries. It is a question in a number of cases here of finished products very important for the manufacture of military products. Thus Japan supplies the United States with optical instruments for space equipment, electronic equipment and so forth.

Attention has to be drawn to one further aspect of the development of world-economic relations of a military-economic nature. The point being that specialization connected with the international division of labor is practiced in two basic directions: product specialization and component (and also stage) specialization.* Sometimes one, sometimes the other type of specialization predominates under different conditions. Product specialization is characteristic primarily of the West European countries and also Japan, but its prevalence in the United States is relatively weak. In West Europe the negative, from the military-economic viewpoint, consequences of such specialization for each individual country are largely smoothed over by the integration processes in the region.

It is different with component and stage specialization. Under its conditions a number of production processes is being taken from the most highly developed states to countries with a relatively low level of development, cheap manpower, raw material and so forth. This phenomenon is connected with the policy of the monopolies, which are endeavoring thus to optimize the production structure and derive as a result of this economic advantages at the time of sale of the finished product.

Ever increasing significance has been attached recently to the problem of providing military industry with energy and other forms of raw material. Essentially a most important point determining the endeavor of the imperialist powers' ruling circles to attach this country or the other to the military and military-economic structure of NATO is the existence in these countries of big reserves of various raw material resources (rubber, tin and so forth) which are extensively used in military industry. And the role of the "raw material" monopolies, which frequently operate in the developing countries hand in hand with Western military-industrial companies, is particularly great here also.

This problem has several "slices" largely reflecting both regional and military-economic specifics. For example, although the United States depends on raw material imports (more than 50 percent of the country's requirements are catered for by foreign supplies of 40 most important types of mineral raw

* Product and component specialization are distinguished in literature, as a rule. However, it would seem expedient here to speak of stage specialization also, which, although close in terms of meaning to component specialization (manufacture of parts of the whole), as distinct from the latter, also incorporates different stages of this manufacture, beginning with recovery of the raw material.

material*), it still has tremendous advantages over its NATO allies and Japan. The United States' imports of many types of raw material is often connected not so much with the limited nature of domestic resources as with purely economic and strategic factors (an endeavor to preserve its own reserves). Furthermore, it can count on the tremendous natural resources of its ally and neighbor--Canada. Finally, the United States practices close economic cooperation with such adjacent countries as Mexico and Venezuela, which play an important part in supplies of oil and petroleum products to the American market.

The West European NATO countries and also Japan and a number of smaller but relatively industrially developed partners of the United States are in an entirely different position. Their dependence on external sources of resources can hardly be compensated for in any way in the event of a suspension of supplies of raw material. Furthermore, for many reasons these countries are not creating such large-scale strategic raw material reserves as the United States. The said circumstances are forcing Washington's partners to operate very assertively together with the United States in the regions which cater for the capitalist world's raw material requirements. In turn, the United States makes extensive use for gaining access to sources of raw material in African countries of the economic and political influence of its European NATO allies. Kinds of lines of raw material interaction oriented toward ensuring uninterrupted supplies like, for example, United States--West Europe--Near and Middle East states, United States--Australia--Japan--ASEAN countries and so forth are being formed.

The export of a tremendous quantity of modern weapons and combat equipment and the creation of the conditions for their servicing and use serve as a very important lever of the expansion of the sphere of influence of the MIC of the United States and the other members of NATO beyond this bloc. It is sufficient to say that in a decade--from 1970 through 1980--the sale of weapons by the leading NATO countries increased in cost terms 18-fold (from \$1.5 billion to more than \$25 billion)** and is continuing to grow, albeit at not such a rapid pace. The bulk of the arms here is supplied to countries which imperialism regards as allies. It is significant that whereas in the period of the 1950's-1960's the United States' NATO partners accounted for approximately 70 percent of total American arms exports, in the period 1971-1975 this proportion had declined to 26 percent*** and by the start of the 1980's to approximately 16 percent. As far as the other NATO countries are concerned, the developing states, primarily those which to a greater or lesser extent pertain to the category of their partners, account for over 90 percent of their arms exports.

These countries' summary spending on the acquisition of arms is greater than that of the other NATO members together. Altogether in the period 1977-1983 the United States and its NATO allies sold outside of this bloc arms and military equipment for a sum total of approximately \$120 billion.****

* See "The Ailing Defense Industrial Base. Unready for Crisis. Report of the Defense Industrial Base Panel of the Committee on Armed Services," House of Representatives, Washington, 1980, p 25.

** FOREIGN MILITARY SALES AND MILITARY ASSISTANCE FACTS, December 1970; INTERAVIA 1980 No 4, p 283.

*** Estimated from the data of CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 26 February 1975, pp S2658-2659; DEFENSE SPACE BUSINESS DAILY, 18 August 1975, p 239.

**** U.S. NEWS AND WORLD REPORT, 28 May 1984, p 59.

The fact that arms exports to the developing states from the leading NATO countries virtually coincide with the amounts of the official economic "assistance" rendered by the United States and its allies is hardly fortuitous. Thus for the period 1976-1980 American "assistance" to the developing states constituted \$26.5 billion, while arms exports amounted to \$22.8 billion.* The imperialist powers are thereby reimbursing to a considerable extent their outlays on this "assistance".

The most obvious consequence of weapons exports is the fact that the countries purchasing the latest complex arms in the United States and the states allied with it are essentially creating in their countries kinds of arsenals which may be used not only by their own armed forces but also, if need be, by the armed forces of the NATO states. Both quantitatively and qualitatively the arms acquired in the West often far exceed defense requirements, and a proportion thereof simply cannot be "digested" by these states' armed forces.

Thus in implementing large-scale supplies of the latest arms and military equipment to a whole number of developing states the United States and other NATO countries are creating additional favorable conditions for the strengthening of their military possibilities in this region or the other, for expanding the direct military "presence" here included. The fact that the developing states' arms purchases are inevitably accompanied by the invitation of numerous foreign specialists and instructors contributes to this to a considerable extent.

A graphic example of how military equipment purchased in the West is used in the interests of the global strategy of American imperialism is the AWACS system which is part of Saudi Arabia's armament. The reasons for its acquisition from the United States were in the past given as the need to defend this country's air space against aggression on the part of Iran. However, inasmuch as Saudi Arabia is incapable of independently ensuring the functioning of this exceptionally complex system and is forced to enlist American specialists (and also to use American satellites) to service it the United States acquires an opportunity to expand at another's expense the zone under constant Pentagon surveillance. Besides the entire territory of Europe, North America and part of the Atlantic and Pacific, it now includes vast expanses of the Near and Middle East.

Another important consequence of the activity of the MIC increasing weapons exports is the fact that the substantial volume of sales of arms and military equipment helps the arms-producer countries maintain a proportion of production capacity (up to 50 percent in a number of cases) in operating condition without the expenditure of additional resources, reduces the prime costs of the manufactured product and ultimately contributes to a considerable extent to the increased mobilizational readiness of military industry. Thus the need to accelerate the fulfillment of export orders and simultaneously to observe the specified times for supplies of F-16 aircraft to the U.S. Air Force led to a 20-percent increase in the monthly rate of manufacture of these aircraft.**

* "Weissbuch 1983. Zur Sicherheit der Bundesrepublik Deutschland und zur Entwicklung der Bundeswehr," Bonn, 1983, p 29.

** FLIGHT INTERNATIONAL, 31 October 1981, p 1312.

There is one further, to a considerable extent concealed, sphere of the activity of the MIC in the international arena. It is a question of the streamlining and development of the infrastructure. As a rule, the countries which are the main purchasers of practically the entire list of conventional arms and equipment have lagged behind considerably economically, particularly as far as development of the infrastructure is concerned. The building of roads, ports, airfields, communications systems and so forth essentially represents an integral part of the militarist processes in the developing states imposed by imperialism. It is impossible either to make efficient use of the available technology or deploy the armed forces without development of the infrastructure. True, in a number of instances the NATO countries, primarily the United States, themselves build or expand the existing installations (in Somalia, Oman and so forth). But to an increasingly large extent this item of expenditure also is being borne by the developing states. Thus of the almost \$300 billion of capital investments allocated by the Saudi Government within the framework of the Third Five-Year Development Plan (1981-1985), it was planned spending over \$100 billion on building facilities of the infrastructure.* A substantial proportion thereof is intended for use for military ends or is "dual"-purpose. Had the Western states themselves had to consent to the corresponding expenditure, this would have cost them tens of billions of dollars extra.

Finally, the American "direct confrontation" strategy has sharply increased the military-economic significance of such a form of cooperation as the granting by partners outside of NATO of their territory for its use by the armed forces of the countries which are a part of this bloc. In some cases the United States may avail itself of existing bases and other installations on a permanent basis, as is the case within the NATO framework, in others it is a question of it being accorded this right in the event of some "external threat" arising. But whatever the case an absence of strong points on the territory of other states would make impossible the implementation of Pentagon strategy providing for the use of American armed forces in parts of the world far from the United States. If we add to this the fact that in a whole number of cases the installations granted NATO, primarily the United States, were built completely or partially from the domestic resources of the "host" states, the military-economic significance of the "territorial" factor grows even more.

At the same time this is also a most risky form of cooperation with the imperialist powers since the presence of foreign armed forces on the territory of this country or the other could mean its automatic involvement in a conflict, even if it itself would like to avoid this. It cannot be ruled out that for the United States the value of a direct military presence in various countries is determined by these considerations also. This presence could be regarded as a kind of guarantee of involvement in the conflict, should such arise, of the entire structure of the aggregate might of imperialism (or its regional components).

The use of bases and other installations pertains, as is known, to the sphere of interstate relations. At the same time, however, the appearance of foreign bases on the territory of the developing states is opening the way to other

* See THE TIMES, 22 December 1981.

forms of relations, in which the NATO countries' military-industrial circles are participating most actively. A concurrence of the functions and interests of the MIC and the official policy of the imperialist states is manifested here also.

Thus in their efforts to enlist in the sphere of influence various countries and regions outside of NATO exercised as a part of general imperialist policy the MIC are operating diversely and along a broad front, encompassing numerous aspects of military and military-economic cooperation. Just as broad is the geography of their activity. This essentially means the new role of the MIC in the formation of the military-economic basis of the aggregate military might of imperialism and the emergence of the complexes far beyond national boundaries given a scale of internationalization of their activity unprecedented even in the relatively recent past.

III

The expansion of military-economic relations in the nonsocialist world in all their diversity and totality should be characterized, we believe, as a process of the formation of a military economy of capitalism developing within the framework of the world capitalist economy. The first stage of this process was the growth of interaction between MIC within the NATO bloc, where in recent decades essentially the nucleus of the present global structure has taken shape.

It is important to note that the intensive internationalization of the imperialist states' military-economic activity was possible only at a certain stage of the development of the world capitalist economy as a whole. The scale and depth of relations between the national economies of the nonsocialist countries were the general economic basis and prerequisite of the gradual formation of capitalism's military economy, of which the international division of labor, specialization, cooperation and integration and also the activity and influence of the transnational corporations are just as characteristic.

At the same time the military sector of the economy has a clearly expressed specific target function--the buildup of military power--and the level of its development is to a very great extent (including the intensiveness of the formation process) connected with the realization of various military-political doctrines, the state of the international situation, military-technical progress and so forth. Finally, being the creation of imperialism's military policy, it is formed primarily as a result of the activity of the MIC of the leading NATO countries.

These distinctions make the process of the formation of the military economy of capitalism a particularly dangerous phenomenon by virtue of the very target function of capitalism's militarist preparations and the consequences to which they are giving rise for the economy and policy of the various states being converted into coparticipants in the realization of the militarist plans of the most aggressive circles of the United States and other NATO members.

A sharp increase in the number of countries enlisted in the sphere of military-economic preparations is hardly to be expected, it would seem, in the immediate future. However, qualitatively, in line with the expansion and interweaving of various forms of interconnections and interaction within the structure taking shape and the further growth of the possibilities of the countries outside of NATO in the military (including military-industrial) sphere, the process of the formation of capitalism's military economy will become increasingly complex and multifaceted. Even now more than 20 developing states participate in joint production with the NATO countries or, at least, the assembly of certain types of modern arms and military equipment,* and their number continues to grow.

It should be noted that often the arms manufactured in the developing states are far cheaper than those produced in the NATO countries. For example, the cost of the construction of military frigates in Peru is 70 percent less than in Italy. Whence the endeavor of the military-industrial monopolies to organize the production of quite complex (although not, of course, the most modern) types of arms and equipment in "third" countries. Thus the formation of the military economy of capitalism entails tangible benefits for the military-industrial monopolies of the leading imperialist states from the viewpoint also of securing the highest possible profits, although it is necessary here to consent to a "sharing" of part of the sales markets with the growing military industry in countries outside of the three "power centers of capitalism".

The expansion of the sphere of activity of the military-industrial monopolies has led to the emergence even now of sufficiently clearly traceable direct and indirect relations between various countries outside of NATO and the members of this bloc, which constitute the actual content of the process of formation of the military economy of capitalism.

An important part in this process is played by the TNC. Many bourgeois specialists express the viewpoint according to which the TNC do not participate actively in international military-economic activity, that they are "producing peaceful products for a peaceful society"**and that the proportion of military production even in the TNC which have contracts in this sphere is small. It is also frequently asserted that the TNC are not interested in an arms race and the exacerbation of international tension inasmuch as they themselves are "the generators of constancy and stability."***

Such assertions are far from reality. Of course, far from all TNC participate in a spurring of the arms race or have an interest therein. But there is no doubt that many leading TNC are playing a very important part in the increase in the scale and expansion of the geographical framework of the process of militarization in the nonsocialist world and the formation of the military economic of capitalism.

* See A. Pierre, "The Global Politics of Arms Sales," Princeton, 1982, p 11.

** See R. Barnet, R. Muller, "Global Reach: The Power of the Multinational Corporations," New York, 1974, p 80.

*** See A. Modsen, "Private Power: Multinational Corporation for the Survival of Our Planet," New York, 1980, p 23.

Thus 152 American companies, which are among the 500 biggest TNC, participate in arms and military equipment exports or engage in the transfer of licenses for their production.* A characteristic feature of the TNC's "military trade" here (which is particularly important from the viewpoint of an evaluation of the impact of the TNC on the formation of the military economy of capitalism) is the fact that together with the finished product they are to an ever increasing extent supplying either production processes in their entirety or, at least, their technology in the form of license exports.**

The majority of leading American military-industrial companies--Boeing, Lockheed, General Dynamics, McDonnell-Douglas, Northrop and so forth--are TNC. The sphere of their activity here outside of the national framework is expanding constantly. The same applies to a whole number of West European companies--British Aerospace, MBB, SNECMA, Thomson, AEG-Telefunken and so forth.

They all have a direct interest in an expansion of the scale of the arms race and an intensification of the role of the militarist component in the foreign policy activity of the NATO countries and the states connected with them. Among the TNC playing an important part in the formation of the military economy of capitalism are also companies operating in the sphere of the production of and trade in energy and other types of strategic raw material. While not producing military equipment directly and not participating in the installation of purely military facilities they are nonetheless organically connected with the militarization process, which has intensified markedly in the NATO countries in recent years and embraced a growing number of states outside of this bloc.

In studying this process it is essential, of course, to consider that it is ensuing under the conditions of acute competitive struggle between the military-industrial complexes of individual imperialist states and power centers of capitalism reflecting the clashes of their frequently contradictory interests in various parts of the world.

Differences between them are manifested quite distinctly on a number of problems of military strategy also, an example of which is the attitude of Washington's partners toward the already-mentioned "Strategic Defense Initiative". Thus all the contradictions inherent in the mutual relations in the imperialist camp as a whole may be observed in full within the framework of the process in question.

A cardinal improvement in the international situation, a limitation of and halt to the arms race and the switching of the resources of all states to the solution of the urgent problems confronting both each of them and all mankind could put an end to the involvement in the orbit of the imperialist states' military preparations of other countries in various regions of the world and hamper the dangerous process of the formation of the international military economy of capitalism--the material basis of the aggregate military power of imperialism.

* G. Kade, M. Schmidt, "Frieden, Ruestung und Monopole," Cologne, 1980, p 28.
** Ibid., pp 66-67.

FRENCH CRITIQUES OF SDI DESCRIBED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 64-71

[Article by A. Kudryavtsev: "France and the American 'Star Wars' Program"]

[Text] A lively polemic has been conducted for many months now in the French mass media around the "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) which has been put forward by the U.S. President and which represents a program for the creation of strike space arms.

Both the singularities of France's position in the Atlantic Alliance and specific interests connected not least with the status of nuclear power have been reflected directly in the general tone of the discussion. Serious criticism of the SDI has been louder here, perhaps, than in other West European capitals. The same factors prompted the French leadership to present a diplomatic initiative aimed at closing off certain important channels of an arms race in space. Later Paris openly dissociated itself from the Reagan administration's attempts to associate the allies' industrial potential with realization of the SDI on terms of junior partners of the transatlantic military concerns.

Specialists Argue

If one were to construct some mean viewpoint from the various viewpoints being expressed in France at expert level on the subject of the "star wars" plans, it would be a negative value.

What has been said by no means signifies, of course, that there have not been in Paris zealous advocates of the militarization of space. These are either Atlantists for whom, as the newspaper of the right LE FIGARO puts it, "a good ally does not do what he wants but wants what is necessary," or representatives of circles closely connected with the military-industrial complex, which is unwilling to let slip a sizable sum in the form of expected Pentagon orders. Retired Adm A. Sanguinetti, a prominent figure of the national peace movement, gave in his recent book "Intoxication With Power" a caustic characterization of these "pseudo-experts". Among them, he writes, is a certain general who since 1958 has worked as commercial director in a major aircraft construction firm. "...As more of a weapons merchant than a strategist,

he is by virtue of this under the influence of his recent trade. There is also a certain ambassador who since he ceased to hold an official position with NATO in Brussels has considered it necessary to assume fulfillment of the official duties of NATO ambassador in France, not ungraciously paraphrasing Atlantic tenets."

The political observer and super-Atlantist P. (Vayzhman) also should be put in the same category with them. Without going to the trouble of some in any way cogent substantiation of his positions, he simply declares any opposition to the "star wars" program a gift to Moscow. The list is continued by M.-F. Garaud, president of the International Geopolitical Institute--an American minion in Paris. The direct influence of transatlantic organizations of a rightwing persuasion of the not unknown Heritage Foundation type shows through in the strategic concepts which she puts forward. In this same part of the political spectrum is also Gen E. Copel, who not so long ago demonstratively resigned as a sign of disagreement with official military doctrine, the basis of which is nuclear restraint. A pacifist general? Rather the reverse. In Copel's opinion, France is not preparing sufficiently energetically for fighting a war in Europe with the use of neutron and chemical weapons. While having bowed in the direction of NATO's "Rogers doctrine," he entreats that the spread of the arms race to near-Earth space be in no event impeded but, on the contrary, that the United States be rendered the utmost assistance here.*

Mention has to be made of one further--invisible--participant in the polemic which has unfolded--the American propaganda machine, which is directly or via figureheads publicizing the "star wars" program. Its activity has not been without trace from the viewpoint of influence on France's public opinion.

Nonetheless, the plans to create a broad-scale ABM system with space-based elements announced by the U.S. President in spring 1983 initially went virtually unnoticed by the French press. This is explained by the fact that Reagan's proclaimed task of a transition from the doctrine of "nuclear restraint" to "mutual assured survival," within the framework of which the security of both sides would be based on a capacity to intercept and destroy the enemy's ballistic missiles, was perceived by specialists as a not particularly serious undertaking. Lack of confidence in the "star wars" concept was caused not so much by the unsolved nature of a whole number of major scientific and engineering problems attending realization of the project. The emphasis in the pronouncement of its opponents was from the very outset put on the fact that creating a totally impenetrable antimissile shield is fundamentally impossible. Expressing these sentiments, F. (Eysburg), expert of France's Defense Ministry, wrote: "It is possible to achieve in laboratories and sometimes on proving grounds a 90-percent hit rate by defensive missiles, as is the case with the use of the most modern antitank weapons and air defense systems. In a real situation... the indicator is lower. The efficiency of defensive missiles organized in combat systems is lower still...."** The same skepticism shows through in the arguments of T. de Monbriale, director of the French Institute of International Relations. Arguing with those who

* See E. Copel, "Vaincre la guerre," Paris, "Lieu commun," 1984.

** POLITIQUE ETRANGERE No 3, 1984, p 576.

unthinkingly believe in the "absolute possibilities" of space defense, he reminds them of a seemingly simple fact. Although manned apparatus has existed since the start of the present century, today, according to the most optimistic estimates, the best air defense systems are capable of shooting down no more than 38 percent of attacking aircraft."*

Despite the efforts of certain circles, Paris was able to discern that the proposition concerning the allegedly "purely defensive" nature of the SDI, whose realization is to make nuclear weapons "powerless and obsolete," is nothing other than an advertising trick which is being employed to sell the Pentagon's space plans to public opinion. Playing on man's psychological predisposition toward defense, the transatlantic traveling salesman, according to (I. Buayye), who has studied the question, have cynically attempted to intercept and "use for themselves the arguments of the antinuclear movement."

A clear understanding that there is a close interconnection between offensive and defensive types of weapons is leading the vast majority of French specialists to diametrically opposite conclusions. In their opinion an inevitable consequence of the creation of a broad-scale space-based ABM system would be a further acceleration of the arms race, that is, a quantitative buildup of offensive weapons and their qualitative improvement for breaking through the "space shield". The well-known political scientist A. Joxe observed in conversation with your correspondent that, as the history of the arms race shows, there is a torpedo for every dreadnought. Even J. (Bomel), president of the rightwing Foundation of the Future political club, which readily makes its platform available to the "star wars" heralds, speaks of an "endless chain of measures and countermeasures."**

Nor does Paris forget that the United States itself is planning for the end of the century an appreciable increase in the number of nuclear warheads on strategic delivery systems and, as J. (Inara), military correspondent of LE MONDE put it, is by no means about to "hand over to the museum the balance of terror."

A lively discussion also developed in the French press around the consequences of the creation of an antimissile system limited in its scale and tasks and aimed no longer at protection of the entire territory and civilian population but merely at covering the launch installations and launchers and strategic nuclear force control centers. It is this "abbreviated" space-based ABM system which Washington has been moving to the forefront recently. And it has to be said that certain specialists, including P. Lellouche, deputy director of the French Institute of International Relations, and also M. Felden, leader of the Plasma Physics Research Lab at Nancy University, have manifestly succumbed to the influence of the American side's modified arguments. They link the reduced risk of the outbreak of nuclear war with the fact that the creation of a limited ABM system would restore the intercontinental missile launchers' invulnerability lost as a consequence of the increased accuracy of the warheads and thereby strengthen the capacity of restraint strategy.

* LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR, 19 April 1985, p 44.

** LES CAHIERS DE LA FONDATION DU FUTUR, September 1984, p 10.

However, there are loose ends at every step in such an "optimistic" interpretation. To take merely the proposition concerning the "window of vulnerability". It was recently played up actively in the United States to justify the buildup of offensive strategic arms. But after the military programs had been launched, many works appeared showing its unsoundness.* How, for example, is the declared search for a more stable foundation of security with the aid of a limited ABM system combined with the United States' intention of simultaneously increasing in its arsenal the significance of particularly accurate nuclear missiles, that is, building up "first strike" potential?

It is not fortuitous that the renovated interpretation of the ultimate goals of the SDI have been subjected to criticism on the part of the majority of French political scientists, including those who are inclined to believe that the militarization of space is inevitable. In their opinion there are impressive reasons why the creation even of the "abbreviated" version of an antimissile defense would have a profoundly destabilizing impact on the balance of strategic forces in the world.

First, the appearance of space weapons will sharply reduce the time available for making critical strategic decisions. Such a change in the situation would on the one hand entail a growth of mutual suspicion and force the sides, in the words of observer M. Tatu (an advocate of "star wars," incidentally), to constantly keep their finger on the raised trigger. On the other, there would be the increased likelihood of an error in the functioning of the increasingly complex arms systems.

Second, however paradoxical at first sight, it is proposed enhancing the degree of survivability of the intercontinental missile launchers by way of covering them with new arms systems considerably more vulnerable than those which exist currently. In fact, it would be sufficient to breach the "safety screen" (as LE MONDE once called the limited version of the ABM system) in one place in order to reduce its overall efficiency dramatically. Some French observers have even discovered an "inconsistency" in Washington's endeavor to simultaneously possess antimissile weapons and prevent accords being reached on antisatellite weapons inasmuch as the latter could hit ABM components deployed in space. The seeming contradiction is also easily removed if one bears in mind the Pentagon's planning of a sudden blinding strike at the enemy's early detection and observation facilities. What these plans really contradict are the assertions concerning the alleged stabilizing consequences of strike space weapons.

Third, the increased uncertainty in strategic planning brought about by the appearance of antimissile systems not only would not "consolidate" the restraint

* It is interesting that in one of its annual reports on the economic and strategic situation in the world the French Institute of International Relations was openly ironic in connection with the proposition concerning the "window of vulnerability" (see "RAMSES-82. Rapport annuel mondial sur le systeme economique et les strategies," Paris, 1982, p 32). Highly contradictory in this respect is M. Felden's book, in which pronouncements in support of the deployment of limited ABM systems justified by the alleged "window of vulnerability" stand alongside calculations showing the preservation of the "balance of restraint" (see M. Felden, "La guerre dans l'espace. Armes et technologie nouvelles," Paris, "Berger-Levrault," 1984, p 30).

factor but would lead to the directly opposite result--a lessening of the opportunities in the restraint sphere. "If you develop weapons making the capacity for a retaliatory strike ineffective or unreliable to the highest extent," (Yu. Vedrin), diplomatic adviser to the president, observed, speaking on radio, "you are moving not toward peace but toward a situation of uncertainty characterized by a greater degree of risk." In the broad plane we have to agree with the specialists who believe that the transition to "mixed restraint" combining offensive--the "nuclear sword"--and defensive--the "space shield"--strategic arms represents a threat to general security inasmuch as it could nurture the illusion of an unpunished preventive nuclear strike.*

French political scientists view the promotion of the SDI in the general context of changes which occurred in the political-strategic thinking of U.S. ruling circles on the eve and at the outset of the 1980's. One of the first in France whose attention was drawn to the growth of aggressive elements therein which had revealed themselves and the shift of the accent from restraint to the strategic use of armed forces was the Interdisciplinary Center for the Study of Peace and Strategic Problems led by A. Joxe. A recent book by the well-known observer P.-M. de la Gorse examines all the changes in American strategic doctrines as interconnected components subordinate to a single goal--creation of the prerequisites for the use of military forces as an active lever of foreign policy. Whence the hope of dually breaking up the evolved parity, which ties the hands and narrows the space for power solutions. "From below"--by providing for the possibility of conducting combat operations without the early use of nuclear weapons, but with the extensive use of particularly accurate weapons of great destructive power (as envisaged in respect of the European theater by the aggressive NATO "Rogers Doctrine"). "From above"--by imparting a material basis to the "limited" and "protracted" nuclear war concepts by way of the combination of substantial counterforce potential with antimissile defenses to lessen the power of a retaliatory strike (it is to this that the American strategic programs are geared). As de la Gorse observes, the intention linked with realization of the SDI consists of "extricating itself from the deadlock created by the nuclear parity between the two biggest powers" and restoring to the United States "the possibility of itself deciding when and where it may use the entire gamut of military resources at its disposal."**

Specialists' apprehension is also caused by the fact that implementation of the "star wars" program is fraught with the threat of the undermining of the foundations of the arms limitation and reduction process and also the agreements which have already been achieved in this sphere--primarily the indefinite Soviet-American Treat Limiting ABM Systems (1972). But there have also been those who have begun to echo the transatlantic proteges of the military-industrial complex endeavoring to sweep aside any treaty-legal impediments in the way of an arms race. The arguments which they are

* This conclusion is reached, for example, by military experts of the Socialist Party (See "La Securite de l'Europe. Texte adopte au Bureau executif du parti socialiste le 26 juin 1985").

** See P.-M. de la Gorse, "La guerre et l'atome," Paris, "Plon," 1985, pp 159-160.

circulating are usually aimed at muddling and perplexing the public. Thus P. Lellouche, for example, asserts that prevention of the militarization of space is a "propaganda myth" inasmuch as near-Earth space became a sphere of military activity long since. Such an assertion is manifestly aimed at gullible people and does not withstand criticism: the military satellites which exist currently are not strike weapons capable of hitting targets in space and from space. It is the appearance of such which would signify a dangerous militarization of near-Earth space.

The same Lellouche deliberately distorts the true reasons which prompted the USSR and the United States to conclude the Treaty Limiting ABM Systems in 1972. To listen to him, the need for the agreement was allegedly dictated in the past solely by the imperfection of the arms. Today, on the other hand, "technical progress is once again rehabilitating the idea of strategic defense" inasmuch as it allegedly makes it possible to ensure an acceptable correlation between its efficiency and its costs.* Let us leave aside the fact that no one has proved the adduced assertion and that it is more than dubious for many specialists. It is important to emphasize something else: the "purely technological" approach absolutely ignores the existence of the direct connection between offensive and defensive arms which was recognized by both sides at the time of the conclusion of the 1972 treaty. Enjoying the reputation of a skilled expert, Lellouche cannot fail to know that no technical progress is capable of canceling this objectively existing connection.

Reality itself refutes the pharisaical assertions that the proclamation of "star wars" plans only facilitates the achievement of accords in the disarmament sphere. As it becomes obvious that the United States is impeding real progress at the Geneva negotiations, notes of perplexity are beginning to creep in even among those who initially had a benevolent attitude toward the American delegation's starting platform. Whereas prior to the start of the Geneva negotiations it seemed to them that the SDI would be used by Washington solely as a lever with which it hoped to "persuade" the USSR to consent to a reduction in the arsenals of offensive arms, then, turning to the course of the Geneva meeting, they are noting not without disquiet the "lack of clarity" in the position of the American delegation. Is "star wars" a means of achieving the success of the Geneva negotiations or are these negotiations being assigned the role of instrument of legalization of "star wars"--this question expresses doubt as to the sincerity of the Reagan administration.

Official Position

Speaking on national television on 16 December 1984, President F. Mitterrand declared that the SDI being advanced by the Reagan administration would lead to "superarms". According to the president, France occupies not an opposite, but a "different" position to the United States in the sense that it is a supporter of the "nonmilitarization of space". At the same time, however, statements of the country's top political leadership have emphasized repeatedly that the onset of the space era will entail the most serious strategic consequences.**

* P. Lellouche, "L'avenir de la guerre," Paris, Mazarine, 1985, p 218.

** Space "...will within the next 30 years have changed all the parameters of world strategy, nuclear included" (from F. Mitterrand's speech in Rennes, 1 February 1985).

The endeavor demonstrated by Paris to dissociate itself from the "star wars" program and at the same time its obvious guardedness in pronouncements in this connection have introduced to the exposition of the official position on the question of the militarization of space a certain fraction of contradictoriness and even ambiguity, which have been grounds for interpreting its essence variously.

What were the reasons for this? On the one hand they were connected with the idea that France's opportunities for influencing the Pentagon's military preparations are extremely limited and that realization of the space ambitions of the American military-industrial complex would sooner or later encounter resistance in the United States itself. On the other, Paris is manifestly reluctant to emphasize the divergence of interests with the powerful ally in such a "sensitive" sphere, the more so under conditions where Washington is applying all levers of pressure, attempting to obtain from the West European partners unconditional support for its "initiative". Finally, in introducing an element of uncertainty to the official position the country's leadership is thereby making it understood to its partners, in the EEC included: if a turn toward the militarization of space occurs nonetheless, France will have sufficient time not to be caught unawares.

Granted all this, the country has an objective interest in prevention of the militarization of space. To judge by officials' statements, Paris recognizes the most dangerous consequences of realization of the "star wars" program for universal peace. Thus French Defense Minister C. Hernu expressed the belief at a meeting of the West German Wehrkunde Military-Science Society that strategic instability and the risk of war would increase with the deployment of broad-scale antimissile systems. In addition, the French leadership believes, whereas everyone would ultimately lose from the transfer of the arms race to space, this is fraught with particularly tangible losses for the security of West Europe. Fears are being expressed in France, as in other West European countries also, that the United States' creation of an ABM system to protect its territory would increase the discrepancy in the degree of security between the Old and New worlds and lead to the "erosion" on this basis of the "indivisibility" of the defense of the North Atlantic alliance.

Attempting to neutralize such fears, Washington began initially to assure the allies that the future "antinuclear umbrella" would be opened above them also. On this side of the Atlantic the American assurances appeared insufficiently convincing. Then the following proposition (which was taken up by local Atlantists) was advanced: a "less vulnerable" United States could allegedly "more effectively" threaten the use of nuclear weapons, and this would allegedly "strengthen" American guarantees to the NATO allies. But to think thus means closing one's eyes to the fact that in the event of the United States' transition to the militarization of space the USSR would inevitably adopt retaliatory measures adequate to the threat that had been created. Thus whatever version of "star wars" is studied, the implementation of any of them would increase the trend toward "rupture of the unity" of the Atlantic defense system. Pointing to this circumstance, C. Cheysson, former minister of external relations, once compared the plans for the creation of a "space shield" over the United States with the building of a new Maginot Line.

Paris' endeavor to prevent a development of events which could jeopardize the "balance of restraint" strategy is connected primarily with the fact that the mechanism of French defense is based thereon. If through Washington's fault the arms race spreads to the sphere of antimissile weapons, national military organizational development would be faced with a difficult dilemma. Either the restraining capacity of France's nuclear forces would be radically reduced and 30 years of effort on their creation would essentially prove to have been unnecessary. Or it would be necessary to become involved in another round of the buildup of military spending--an extremely undesirable alternative, considering the high cost of the production of modern weapons and the long-term reduction in the economic growth rate. In the event of it being realized, the SDI could prove the detonator of an arms race of such a scale that in the future, it is feared here, there would arise the question of the financial and even technological possibilities of the country's preservation of the place and role of great power.

The choice of the main directions of military organizational development is extraordinarily complicated even today. There are figures in the military-political establishment calling for an immediate concentration of resources to ensure France's presence "in the future space confrontation". One of them, hiding behind the "Hoplite" pseudonym, contemplates by the start of the next century the deployment of antimissile complexes capable of covering the country's strike nuclear forces and four-five big cities.* Gen P. Gallois, who in the past did much for the theoretical development of the French "from the weak to the strong" restraint concept and who now, however strangely, has found himself in the camp of the "star wars" disciples, propagandizes his "European space defense" plan. It is to consist of mirrors launched into low orbits and turned toward the targets by the energy of powerful lasers, which it is proposed deploying in the Alps. An article by a group of high-ranking officials of the Defense Ministry signed by a pseudonym provides an idea of the intensiveness of the hidden struggle of currents in military circles. Responding to the homespun supporters of strike space weapons, they write: "France has no need to become involved in this adventure, so unreliable is its technical feasibility, partial and reversible its foreseeable results... substantial its costs."**

At the same time, while having confirmed adherence to the restraint concept, in 1984 the French Government decided "preventively" to allocate Fr550 million to ensure cover for and the penetration of an enemy's defenses of warheads with which the submarine-based M-4 missiles are equipped.*** According to press data, for a number of years research has been under way in France (the ["ARMEL'']) Program) on means of protecting delivery systems and nuclear warheads against laser beams. The strategic yearbook prepared by the Higher National Defense Research Institute with the assistance of the military department allows of the possibility of the deployment in the mid-1990's of an "aerodynamic delivery system" (the cruise missile) instead of the earlier contemplated SX mobile ballistic missiles. Special literature provides the specifications of the next-generation M-5 missile: it may be equipped for flight at low trajectories.

* LE MONDE, 6 March 1985.

** Ibid., 7 June 1985.

*** LE MATIN, 11 November 1984.

A group (immediately dubbed the "Space Headquarters" by the press) was formed quite recently under the auspices of the Defense Ministry for coordinating activity pertaining to the military use of near-Earth space. Its creation was justified thus: "a space presence is a most important gage for our defense." It is a question of the deployment of space warning, observation and communications facilities ("we must have a chance to see, hear and maintain communications"). Satellite Telecom-1 B, which will be a basic component of the new Syracuse system of communications between the troops and command centers, was launched in May 1985. Negotiations are being conducted with the FRG on the joint construction of military observation satellite (the ["Samro"] project). But such R&D of a military nature is not geared to the creation of strike space weapons and does not transgress the dangerous boundary beyond which the militarization of space begins.

France's negative attitude toward the American "star wars" program is also explained by fears that it could mix up the cards in the political game which Paris is playing in West Europe. R. Debray, political scientist and public affairs writer and former adviser of the president of the republic, called Europeism "modern Gaullism". We shall not argue the extent to which this formula is justified. But of one thing there is no doubt: currently consolidation of the West European power center, reliance on which is being regarded increasingly often as an essential condition of the realization of national interests, is a principal priority of French foreign policy. For the sake of this Paris is today prepared to consent to the admittance of supranational elements in the functioning of EEC institutions, an acceleration of the movement toward political union and increasingly close rapprochement with Bonn, which is called on to serve as "the locomotive of European building" as a whole.

It is no secret that Paris intends securing for itself the leading position in a "little Europe," relying on its own nuclear forces. A recently published document of the French Socialist Party Executive Bureau speaks of the existence of the close connection between the security of France on the one hand and of West Europe, primarily the FRG, on the other. As the authors assert, "the transition from 100 to 500 warheads... will make it possible to entrust to the strike forces dual functions--defense of national territory and the expansion of restraint"--inasmuch as "there will be an increase in their destructive power and flexibility of use."*

The American plans for the militarization of space fit poorly into such calculations of Paris. The appearance of antimissile defenses of even a small scale would limit the flexibility (set of alternatives) of the use of the strategic forces. Given such a development of events, the capacity for expanded restraint and the security guarantees ensuing therefrom for other states and at the same time the nuclear trump card being played by France in "European building" would be devalued. In any event, as specialists observe, progress toward the rudiments of a European defense with the participation of the French strategic potential would be made abruptly more complex.

* "La Securite de l'Europe. Texte adopte au Bureau executif du parti socialiste le 26 juin 1985," pp 8-9.

Paris is also disturbed by the fact that an indirect consequence of the American "star wars" plans could be increased centrifugal trends in the EEC. Playing on the differences in the allies' geopolitical situation, Washington would like to attach to itself the principle European supporter of the SDI in the shape of Bonn. There is among certain West German circles, LE MONDE writes, "an obvious interest in participation in the development of the latest military technology, control over which would enable it to once again reach leading positions in Europe" and, we would add, compensate for the lack of nuclear weapons.

Most recently malfunctions have become increasingly frequent in the mechanism of Franco-West German cooperation. The stumbling block has been the question of the FRG's attitude toward the program for the militarization of space. Having supported it at the last meeting of the "big seven," Bonn essentially occupied a position opposite to that of Paris. It is not difficult to understand why the French mass media immediately sounded the alarm, appealing not least to the European-minded factions of the FRG ruling classes. A preferential orientation toward Washington, via association with the SDI included, would mean Bonn "turning its back on Europe" and a decline in its interest in a deepening of regional integration and would weaken a most important support for the entire edifice of "Eurobuilding". In the more distant future it is fraught with an undesirable change for Paris in the balance of forces within the EEC and the FRG's expanded freedom of action.

All this is prompting the French Government to oppose the plans to transfer the arms race to space. Paris has firmly declared its adherence to a strategy of restraint which would proceed from a balance of offensive arms at as low a level as possible. France has called repeatedly for observance of the 1967 treaty governing the principles of states' activity pertaining to the conquest of space and the 1972 Treaty Limiting ABM Systems, that is, agreements preventing the military use of space in a number of areas. Paris welcomed the start of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva on the basis of arrangements agreed by the sides earlier, which, as is known, stipulate that the subject of the negotiations will be questions concerning space and nuclear arms examined and solved in their interconnection.

In June 1984 the French Government presented an initiative at the Geneva Disarmament Conference on the start of a multilateral exchange of opinions for the purpose of reaching an agreement, first, banning the testing and deployment on the ground, in the atmosphere and in space of arms systems operating on the basis of the guided transfer of energy which would be capable of destroying ballistic missiles and satellites and, second, on a strict limitation of antisatellite systems, including a ban on antisatellite weapons capable of hitting targets in high orbit. The French proposal was not free of certain contradictions caused by its partial nature. It left open, for example, questions concerning missile strike space weapons and antisatellite weapons capable of destroying satellites put into low orbit. However, Paris' initiative proceeded in principle from the need to take urgent specific steps to close off the channels of an arms race in space and was aimed at preserving the strategic balance.

The appearance of the "star wars" program galvanized Paris' "technological diplomacy". Besides the political-strategic consequences of realization of the SDI, it is putting West Europe on its guard for one further reason. The tremendous expenditure on its realization could entail deep-lying structural changes in the sphere of R&D. The technological spurt of the United States would only increase the lag that has been discerned in the Old World in the civil and, subsequently, in the military sectors of the economy. In the face of the American challenge France has attempted to assume the role of "federator" of the "little Europe" partners.

The first step in this direction was a joint program for the conquest of space up to the year 2000. A decision was adopted at the meeting in January 1985 in Rome of the European Space Agency, which incorporates 11 states, to have increased the organization's spending 75 percent by the start of the 1990's. These resources will go on the creation of the Ariane-5 delivery system capable of launching heavy satellites weighing up to 4.5 tons into high geostationary orbit and the development of a manned module for an American orbital station. Despite Bonn's refusal to assume precise financial commitments, the final communique, at Paris' insistence, contains a mention of the Hermes multiple-use spaceship project. As yet France will undertake independently this project, on which the Dassault and SNIAS firms have been working since the mid-1970's. According to data of the National Space Research Center, the Hermes, which is to be put into space by the Ariane-5, will be able to take up to 6 tons of payload and will have increased maneuverable possibilities in orbit compared with the current American Shuttle. Some local press organs have termed the decisions of the Rome meeting historic in the sense that it laid the foundations for West Europe's independent policy in respect of space exploration.

The next step in the direction of unification of "little Europe's" scientific-technical potential in the face of the American challenge was an initiative presented by President F. Mitterrand--the Eureka project--which provides for the organization of close cooperation among West European countries in the sphere of the latest technology. The need for the creation of a "technological Europe" was spoken of long since, but, however strange this may seem, the transfer of the question to the practical plane was helped by... the Reagan administration. At the session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group held at the end of March this year in Luxembourg the United States proposed that its allies reply within the period of 2 months whether they consented to participate in realization of the SDI. It was not even a question of the arrogant form in which the ultimatum-type "invitation" was clothed. Paris immediately doubted the sincerity of the demarche of the United States, which usually is extremely reluctant to consent to the transfer to its partners of "sensitive" technology, to which the experience of transatlantic cooperation in the building of Spacelab testifies. In addition, the association of the West European countries with realization of the SDI would threaten to bring about a kind of brain drain across the Atlantic and would at the same time hand over to Washington an additional lever of control over the technology relations of the allies. Finally, the time specified for a response and the proposed bilateral form of cooperation manifestly expressed an endeavor to disunite the EEC countries and prevent the coming into being of West European cooperation in the sectors of the future.

It is precisely the unwillingness to become subcontractors of the American military-industrial complex which explains why Paris' idea of the pooling of "little Europe's" resources and the strengthening of its own scientific potential, which was initially given a cool reception, has begun to blaze a trail for itself quite quickly. It earned the approval of the Council of Europe in Milan (end of June), while a meeting of 17 West European states at foreign and scientific research minister level opened in Paris in mid-July. At the same time divergences of viewpoint have been revealed among the partners also. Although the participants in the meeting agreed to adopt as the basis the classification of research proposed by France (information science, microelectronics, artificial intelligence, new materials, biotechnology and problems lying at the intersection of electronics and optics) and the research corresponding thereto, they were unable to agree on which specific programs should be incorporated in the Eureka project. The principle of the mixed--private and public--financing of the developments incorporated in Eureka has been determined, but the question of ways of mobilizing the necessary monetary resources has not been resolved.

The initiators of Eureka are emphasizing its "purely civilian" nature in every possible way. However, observers are drawing attention to the fact that technologies which could be used both for peaceful and military purposes constitute the nucleus of the project. The correlation between West European firms' participation in Eureka and the SDI remains unclear. Some representatives of the local military-industrial complex connected in this form or the other with American military corporations working for the Pentagon are presenting the European initiative merely as an attempt to create the most favorable conditions for association with the "star wars" program. They refer here to large-scale transatlantic credit and possible orders in the event of the United States' development of strike space systems. Some people harbor illusions that participation in the SDI will enable West Europe to influence the American program for the militarization of space. As the experience of the past shows, such illusions are totally groundless. The conversion of space into an arena of confrontation may only be prevented by erecting a barrier in the way of realization of the plans of Washington strategists.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850
CSO: 1816/2

ISRAEL: WHAT NEXT?

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 72-78

[Article by Ye. Dmitriyev: "Israel: What Next?"]

[Text] Not only Tel Aviv's political failures but also the serious weaknesses and flaws which have long been organically inherent in the political system of this country and which have right up to the present had an impact on many, frequently decisive parameters of its domestic and foreign policy were manifested graphically in the course of Israel's invasion of Lebanon in the summer of 1982. "The events in Lebanon," the British FINANCIAL TIMES observed in this connection, "showed that there is reason to doubt the quality of the country's political leadership. The Lebanon adventure demonstrated to Israel primarily the limited nature of the possibilities of military power given its use to achieve political goals."*

Three years have elapsed since the time of the armed aggression in Lebanon. For Israel this period has been rich in the most diverse, sometimes contradictory events. A distinctive accompaniment was the practically general recognition that the crude, myopic policy of avowed expansion in respect of the Arab neighbors and the cynical and impudent "slamming of the door" on all initiatives on questions of a Near East settlement and all proposals pertaining to a solution of the Palestinian problem have led the country along a disastrous path. On the eve of the special Knesset elections in July last year all the "painful" problems of Israeli society came to the surface and had a definite impact on the mood of the electorate.

I

It is more than a year since the elections. Perfectly sufficient time for some new (or renewed) directions of the activity of the Israeli leadership to have had a chance to show their worth and for an evaluation at its worth of the degree of realism and practical possibilities of implementation of the plans for economic recovery, a solution of the problems of employment (according to estimates, in the immediate future unemployment in Israel will amount to

* THE FINANCIAL TIMES, 27 March 1984.

200,000 out of a population of almost 4 million), the curbing of inflation and the strengthening of the country's foreign policy positions, which were shaken to the utmost as a result of the aggression in Lebanon. The plans with which Israel's two main political forces: the Likud, the tune therein called by the ultraright Herut, and MAARAKH, the basis of which is the Israeli Labor Party--(MAI)--which has little in common with the genuine interests of the working people, operated on the eve of the elections.

On the eve of the elections it was the common opinion of political observers that the approximate balance of forces and possibilities of the Likud and MAARAKH would lend particular significance to the kind of "slough" which exists in the Israeli electorate--a considerable group of voters with unsettled political views whose vacillation and zigzags could exert an appreciable influence on the next composition of the Knesset and the fate of the government. It was not therefore fortuitous that in the course of the election struggle the two leading political groupings paid particular attention to the enlistment on their side of the sympathies and supporters of the small parties.

The election results corroborated the forecasts: henceforward the representatives of 15 (!) political parties and groupings out of the 26 which participated in the elections would sit in the Knesset. An excellent argument, seemingly, for the advocates of Tel Aviv's permanently aggressive policy and its "sympathizers" from the ranks of international Zionist organizations for the development of the latest clamor concerning "political pluralism," the "genuine democracy" of Israel's political system and so forth. However, they prefer not to touch on this subject.

Why not? It is quite simple. It is no secret that the appearance in the country's political arena of a group of small parties of a rightwing-nationalist persuasion testifies to the intensification of political and class polarization in the country, a strengthening of the positions of the traditionally rightwing-religious--parties and the considerably more prevalent than before mood of open anti-Arab chauvinism and extremism. "The elections," the American press observed, "demonstrated the new political prestige of extremism in Israel. The politics of malice are bearing fruit.... The most disastrous proof is the election to the Knesset of Rabbi Kahane."*

The term "Kahanism" even, which, the French LA LIBERATION believes, "amounts to two main ideas--it is necessary to expel all Arabs from Eretz Israel' and to create a theocratic Jewish state"**--has appeared in Israel'. Particularly dangerous, paractically all observers stress, is the fact that nationalist extremism with a religious coloring is becoming increasingly prevalent among Israeli youth, primarily among the young Sephardis--Jews with their origins in Asian and African countries with a considerably lower educational level than the Ashkenazis (Jews with their origins in North America and Europe) and lower socioeconomic status.

* NEW REPUBLIC, 13-20 August 1984, p 8.

** LA LIBERATION, 29 June 1985.

Against the background of the pronounced success of the small rightwing-nationalist parties it became clear that a new government could be formed only with their participation or approval. Very indicative in this connection was the acknowledgment of the leftwing-Zionist HA'ARETZ: "It is a sad fact that the substantial Knesset majority which the government possesses does not improve things. The clericals continue to have the country by the throat. In defiance of logic, this 'big' government is just as dependent on the 'small' clericals as previous governments formed on the basis of one bloc. Despite all the disagreements, both blocs believe that if the government falls, this will be the fault of the small coalition members."*

As is known, as a result of the elections a coalition government was formed headed by S. Peres, leader of the MAARAKH, and Y. Shamir, leader of the Likud, who took the post of foreign minister. In the Knesset the MAARAKH is now represented by 44 members (it lost 3 seats compared with the 1981 elections), while the Likud is represented by 41 (it lost 7 seats). There is to be a kind of political castling after the first 25 months. Shamir will head the cabinet, while Peres will replace him as head of the foreign policy department.

The approximately 2 months of negotiations between the leadership of the Likud and the MAARAKH on the creation of a coalition government culminated in the adoption of a concerted action program for the future cabinet which reflected practically all the domestic and foreign policy complexities with which Israel is currently confronted.**

Foreign policy problems occupied the main place in the program of the new cabinet. The catastrophic failures of Israel's foreign policy, which had found concentrated expression in the failure of the armed adventure in Lebanon, and the sharp growth of the discontent of broad strata of the population worried by Israel's progressive "loss of face" in the eyes of world public opinion--all this forced the authors of the program to bring foreign policy to the forefront.

To quit or not to quit Lebanon--the government was not, perhaps, faced with this question. It was clear that it had to quit, and as quickly as possible. The snowballing resistance of the Lebanese and Palestinians and the tangible losses in manpower and equipment in which the criminal venture of Begin and Sharon had resulted for the army of occupation had forced even the avowed "hawks" to agree that the Israeli troops should be withdrawn from Lebanon "with dispatch".

Simultaneously the program attempted to somehow solve the question of the restoration of relations with the countries which as a sign of protest against the Israeli leadership's aggressive policy had deemed it impossible to maintain relations with Tel Aviv. A highly "transparent" hint was made that it was essential that the government attempt to restore diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union, which had never queried the question of the legitimacy of Israel's existence, but had always consistently and uncompromisingly opposed its aggressive policy, regardless of which government or which political party was in power in this country.

* HA'ARETZ, 4 February 1985, p 9 (in Hebrew).

** See THE JERUSALEM POST, 12 September 1984.

The foreign policy "immobilism" of the Israeli leadership, which was manifested in the fact that the program extolled, as before, the "Camp David peace process" as the sole path toward peace in the Near East, calls attention to itself. The government's readiness to resume the manifestly futile negotiations concerning so-called "administrative autonomy" for the Palestinians was combined in the program of the coalition cabinet with the politically myopic denial, which has become customary for Tel Aviv, of the need to conduct negotiations with the PLO and rejection of the idea of the creation of a Palestinian state.

Referring to a "lack of resources," the participants in the government coalition declared their "restrained" attitude toward the program for the building of settlements on the occupied territories, but hereupon stipulated that the government "guarantees" the security of the settlements which have already been created.

It is significant, finally, that neither the MAARAKH nor the Likud ventured to somehow limit the influence of the clericals, avoiding the long-urgent question of possible changes in the structure of religious institutions in the country.

The deliberate vagueness of the wording of the government program is not fortuitous. It suits (or, at least, it suited until recently) the government coalition partners, preserving for them a certain freedom of maneuver within the framework of their intraparty discussion and practical actions.

Such are the purely outward attributes of the present political situation in Israel. The deep-lying processes which are occurring in this country and which come to the surface in periods of crisis situations such as the aggression in Lebanon are of a latent nature. But it is they which determine the country's political appearance and dictate this action or the other to its leadership and opposition forces.

II

The most serious question, perhaps, on which the survivability not only of the present cabinet but also of Israel's entire political system depends, is the need to extricate the national economy from the catastrophic quagmire of inflation, complexities and contradictions into which it has been led for many years by its government policy of expansion and war. It is significant that the country's foreign debt is growing constantly. On the eve of the July 1984 election it had already amounted to \$21-23 billion.* The increase in the foreign debt testifies to the Israeli leadership's manifest incapacity to confine itself to its own resources and not resort to foreign loans and the assistance of international, primarily American, Zionist organizations. In addition, an endeavor to win popularity at any price and hold on to power dictated to the Likud bloc and its ministers measures to maintain an "atmosphere of prosperity" in the country which were not underpinned economically. Wages grew together with inflation, the amount of consumption was in no way limited

* THE FINANCIAL TIMES, 17 January 1984.

and currency deals on an unprecedented scale (in the first quarter of 1984 alone Israelis purchased \$350 million) were essentially encouraged. Practically no measures were implemented to reduce the inordinately swollen public spending.

A most serious problem of the Israeli economy is dependence on foreign, primarily American, multibillion-dollar "grants" constituting from \$3 billion to \$5 billion a year. In recent years the country's economy has found itself tied most closely to the dollar, and its fluctuations are just as painfully tangible as the difficulties constantly being experienced by the local currency--the shekel. The indexing of savings and wages per the dollar exchange rate combined with widespread speculative transactions is leading to the catastrophic position of the national economy being inadequately perceived by the population, the more so in that the preservation of its living standard under the Likud government was effected artificially and not thanks to economic growth. S. (Sitton), professor of economics at Tel Aviv University, pointed to the following howling anomalies of Israel's economic development: "From 1973 through 1984 GNP grew on an average 2.7 percent annually, while private consumption grew 4.7 percent, and capital investments declined 1.1 percent. In practicing such a system we are sacrificing our future."*

The significance of Israel's "parallel economy," that is, resources which have accumulated among the population, is tremendous, and this is acknowledged by practically all local economists. Precisely determining the amounts of these resources is impossible. According to certain data, their sum total constitutes approximately \$30 billion, whereas the country's GNP constitutes only \$20 billion. "Now we are no longer combating inflation but planning it," a local economist joked bitterly.

It is coming to be generally acknowledged that the main cause of the progressive deterioration in recent years in the state of the national economy is the government's aggressive policy and the military adventure in Lebanon. Even an official report of Israel's Central Bank admitted that "in allocating 20 percent of its GNP for defense (read: preparation and realization of the aggression in Lebanon and upkeep of the army of occupation--Ye.D.) Israel is depriving itself of a chance to one day have done with the present economic problems."**

The economic policy of the Likud government on the eve of the elections was distinguished by open swings from side to side, which could have attested merely the absence of any real reference points in its practical activity and the muddle which reigned in the upper stories of the state mechanism responsible for the state of the national economy. "The country's economy," even the Israeli press admitted, "has been emasculated owing to the lack of capital investments,"*** although the amount of ready cash in circulation owing essentially to the uncontrolled, unchecked emissions of paper money had gone beyond all reasonable limits.

* LA LIBERATION, 1 July 1985.

** THE JERUSALEM POST, 31 May 1984.

*** Ibid.

Following the assumption of office by the coalition government certain measures were adopted to stabilize the economy. They were implemented within the framework of so-called "social contracts" between the government, the country's leading trade union association--the Histadrut--and the Employers Association. A provision of the first "social contract" provided for a price freeze. Inflation subsided somewhat. The second "social contract" was aimed at strengthening the trend toward a decline in inflation which had been discerned. However, its results, the French LE MONDE believed, were overwhelming and "completely shook both the leaders and the population of Israel."

The point being that in April even the cost of living again rose sharply, the state had again sunk into the abyss of superinflation and prices in the first 4 months of 1985 had leaped 60 percent. "The rebirth of the hydra of inflation," LE MONDE wrote, "is explained by the basic and same reason--the government's almost complete incapacity for practicing real economies in budget resources.... The modest economies exist, alas, only on paper. Each time that the treasury attempts to put them into practice, the ministers concerned raise a loud clamor and threaten to resign. In a word, everyone urges economies, but for others. Furthermore, Finance Minister Modai (Likud) is not, evidently, much of a believer in the effectiveness of his policy. He is more attracted by a strict policy of a sharp reduction in budget expenditure, prolonged recession and high unemployment."*

Ministers from the "Labor Party" (the leading member of the coalition) and Prime Minister Peres personally for a long time did not dare take such steps, fearing general anger and a breach of the "social contracts". But, as they say, life has its way. Following many hours of discussion a government "economic recovery" program was adopted on 1 July. During discussion thereof the cabinet had split, two-thirds voting for adoption of the program, the rest against. It was decided to reduce the state budget by \$750 million. A system of capital investments was envisaged. The shekel was again devalued (by 19 percent this time) against the dollar. The prices of food products and basic necessities increased by almost one-fourth on average. Rates leaped: by 82 percent for water use, 53 percent for electricity use and 40 percent for postal services. Prices of a number of food products rose on average 25-30 percent, and there was a palpable rise (17 percent) in the cost of apartments.

The working people's response was not long in coming. A general 24-hour strike called by the Histadrut began on 2 July. Speaking in the Knesset, its general secretary I. Kessar, declared that the main burden of the government's new economic policy was once again to be borne by the workers and employees.

The actions taken by the government in the economic sphere markedly complicated the position of Prime Minister Peres personally, who, to judge by certain data, "was scoring points" in the eyes of the public compared with the leader of Likud--the coalition partner--Shamir. Whereas immediately following the elections in July 1984 the American press was predicting not without regret that "any new government, whether formed by the (MAI) or Likud,

* LE MONDE, 17 May 1985.

promises to be a rickety fragmentary structure which could collapse at any moment,"* subsequently the tone of the evaluations changed. "After almost 5 months in office," MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL observed, "the national unity coalition has refuted the gloomy prophesies merely by the fact that it has survived and, what is more, is functioning, despite the tremendous difficulties."**

However, more farsighted political observers noted that Peres' gradual movement into the foremost positions and the appearance of "trial balloons" manifestly inspired by the "Labor Party" concerning the possibility of early Knesset elections for the purpose of consolidating the MAARAKH's leading position, further discrediting the Likud and forming a government without the participation of its representatives--all these factors will recede into the background when the government embarks on the solution of serious problems. "The political struggle between the two main sides--the MAARAKH and the Likud--...could resume when the economic problem comes to be tackled, and this includes reduced spending on the occupation in Lebanon," the British press wrote.***

Strictly speaking, this struggle never ceased. Immediately following the elections and even after the formation of the coalition government the two main participants in the coalition began a struggle to enlist potential allies on their side--the delegates of the small parties. Until most recently the Likud's positions had weakened. As the AP correspondent reported, Shamir "has submissively receded into the background in anticipation of the time when he will be able to return to power." His own position in the Likud and the Herut Party has also weakened markedly.

The elections to the Histadrut, which has long been considered a kind of "school" for Israel's future political leaders, held on 13 May of this year ended in success for the MAARAKH representatives (66.7 percent of the vote). It was not fortuitous that former prime minister L. Eshkol, G. Meir and a number of other prominent figures began their political career precisely in the Histadrut. All this is creating conditions whereby early elections could be perfectly possible. Peres, according to press reports, "felt sufficiently confident to warn unruly members of the Knesset that he would resign without a moment's hesitation"**** in the event of Likud resistance to his plans and intentions.

Serious fissures in the coalition government gave rise to the question of the withdrawal of the occupation forces from Lebanon. The inglorious "Lebanon adventure" resulted in tragedy for many Israeli families. Some 63.8 percent of Israelis, according to the results of a poll conducted this April, supported immediate withdrawal from Lebanon.

A manifestly inspired propaganda racket concerning "Palestinians' infiltration" of South Lebanon, the "return of PLO fighters to Beirut" and so forth began in

* TIME, 6 August 1984, p 24.

** MIDDLE EAST INTERNATIONAL, 8 February 1985, p 6.

*** Ibidem.

**** JEWISH CHRONICLE, 17 May 1985.

the press--and not only Israeli--in order for the occupation of the southern areas of this Arab country to continue. Behind this campaign was the "butcher" Sharon--the principal performer in and an instigator of the bloody events in Lebanon in the summer and fall of 1982. He publicly attacked the head of the government, accusing him of deliberate actions to undermine the notorious "security of Israel". Under such conditions Peres, in the opinion of the American press, in consenting to the withdrawal of forces from Lebanon without linking this question with the presence there of Syrian forces, "left himself open to political attacks on the part of the Likud if there are indications that the PLO is once again ensconcing itself in South Lebanon or if terrorist acts across the border begin once again."*

In other words, the existence of a whole number of unsolved questions of Israel's foreign and domestic policy "bequeathed" by the 7-year Likud rule, on whose solution the Likud and MAARAKH have been simply afraid to embark, testified that there was in the government only the semblance of the coalition partners' agreement and that same "marriage of convenience". This has been confirmed by the entire subsequent development of events.

III

Even the most fleeting survey of the problems confronting Israel currently leads to the conclusion that this state, its domestic and foreign policy and the country's entire political system are in a state of profound crisis. There has been an avowed shift to the right of Israel's political life, an indicator of which was the success of the small rightwing-nationalist parties at the recent Knesset elections. The fragile political balance which was born as a result of these elections is manifestly makeshift.

Avowed speculators and numerous "jobbers" and "makers of money from air" are thriving. Inflation does not affect them, it is even profitable to them since it creates freedom of maneuver for financial speculation, sometimes of the most fantastic characteristics. Ordinary people, workers and new immigrants can barely make ends meet. And for many of them the country's foreign policy is some abstract phenomenon without a direct influence on their situation. Zionists, who have an interest in the constant support in Israeli society of a "state of siege," as the prominent French orientalist scholar M. Rodinson once put it, are organizing outbursts of anticomunist, anti-Soviet and anti-Arab hysteria. These outbursts, which are inflaming Israel's already troubled political life, also reflect a political passivity and indifference of the broad masses of Israelis. It should be as clear as can be to any unprejudiced person that the Soviet line in Near East matters is based on the principle of justice for all and, consequently, takes account of Israel's just national interests and does not question the legitimacy of its existence.

At the same time, however, this country's leadership is manifestly in the grip of anti-Soviet stereotypes, evidently not least fearing that many international and American Zionist organizations would turn away from Israel if "elements

* THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, 16 January 1985.

of restraint" appeared in its policy in respect of the Soviet Union, in other words, manifestations of political realism to which neither Israel's present leaders nor their sympathizers and patrons abroad can rise.

Characteristic of the mood of the broad mass of Israelis is also a strengthening of a purely pragmatic approach to Zionist tenets and concepts persistently drummed into citizens' consciousness by official propaganda. This approach is manifested in the fact that the ordinary Israeli only "hears" the Zionist "sirens" when he feels that he derives from this some personal benefit. At the same time, considering this circumstance, Zionist ideologists frequently vary their propaganda methods. For example, the start of the aggression in Lebanon and its development caused an increase in openly anti-Arab, chauvinist sentiments in the country for the added reason that in the "justifications" of the need for this aggression there figured, in particular, the proposition concerning the possibility of the establishment of control over the water sources of South Lebanon for the needs of the agriculture of the northern areas of Israel (Galilee) and their conversion into an area of highly profitable agriculture whose products would be very competitive on the world market and would bring the country many millions in additional hard-currency revenue.

The general situation in Israel is such that it is increasingly being called a "country without a future". It is not surprising that emigration is on the rise and that more people are leaving the country than are entering it. The "earthly paradise" painted by Zionist propagandists is resulting both for the indigenous inhabitant and the recent immigrant in unemployment and an inevitable running into debt. All this is being made worse by the constant uncertainty as to what the future will bring--a new war with the Arabs, regular jumps in the prices of basic necessities, a further intensification of the American financial bondage or a new reduction in state resources allocated for social needs. Even here we see manifestations of the policy of aggression and war: whereas directly in Israel schools in which there are 40 and more children to a class are no rarity, on the occupied Arab land, which, in the opinion of the Israeli leadership, which aspires to their eternal consolidation and the "attachment" of these territories to Israel economically and politically, needs to be settled by Jewish "colonists," schools are being created even if there are two children to a class.

Constant anxiety concerning the future is a reason for the increasing emigration from Israel. The "country without a future" is on the threshold of events which could determine its development for many years to come. Many political observers consider abandonment of the policy of aggression and war, the switching of resources to the development of the national economy and the state's increased assistance in social questions virtually impossible under conditions where Zionist, chauvinist, racist ideology literally saturates all political and public institutions, determines the government's course in questions not only of foreign but also domestic policy and lies heavy on the consciousness of the ordinary Israeli with its postulates and dogmams, which are divorced from real life. It is Zionism which is behind the avowed reluctance of the Israeli leadership to find a "peace formula" in relations with neighboring countries and peoples. Simultaneously a Judaism which has been politicized by the Zionists

is contributing to the formation and inculcation of racist concepts in the consciousness of Israelis and increasing the already extreme aggressiveness of the Israeli state.

Anti-Arab chauvinism permeating all Israeli political institutions, which is derived from Zionist postulates concerning "the Jews' innate superiority to the Arabs" covered by talk about the "eternal nature of Arab anti-Semitism" and Arab "intolerance" in respect of the Jews--these are the specific manifestations of racism and racial discrimination which are encountered at every step and in the practical activity of Israeli political, state and public organizations. This cannot be denied, numerous facts confirm the characterization of Zionism as a form of racism and racial discrimination.

The demagogic verbal equilibrilistics of certain Zionist leaders designed to wash off from Israel the shameful stigma of a racist state do not alter the essence of the matter. After all, Zionist propaganda claims that every Jew is a Zionist and that Israel is the actual embodiment of Zionist ideals. Such arguments are multipurpose. And they are intended not least to befuddle the class and political consciousness of the Israeli people. And, perhaps, even more important: Zionist propaganda attempts by such claims to instill in Jews of the Diaspora that they, if they wish to call themselves Jews, must identify themselves fully with Zionism and the policy of the Israeli Government. It is not fortuitous that the definition of Zionism given in the "Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel" says plainly: "Zionism contributes to the intensification and strengthening of the Jewish consciousness throughout the world. Following the creation of the Jewish state, the concept of Zionism expanded and now incorporates material and moral assistance to Israel."*

In fact the "expansion" of the concept of Zionism through the need for the "moral and material support" of the state of Israel results in interference in the internal affairs of other states on contrived, false pretexts, avowed anti-Arab chauvinism, the flouting of the legitimate national rights of the Arab people of Palestine, a refusal to participate in constructive efforts aimed at normalization of the situation in the Near East and emphatic obstructionism in respect of the PLO.

Political life in Israel is variegated, changeable and highly contradictory. Many of its phenomena are currently coming to the surface, others are temporarily receding into the background. The serious and constantly growing complexities which confront the Israeli state and society cannot be solved by way of continuation of the policy of expansion and war. This truth is becoming increasingly graphic and clear with every passing day.

At the same time there has also been a pronounced movement to the right in the country's political life. The "attachment" of the Israeli military-industrial complex to the United States and the dependence of the national economy on the multibillion-dollar American injections are leading to Washington and Tel Aviv operating increasingly often in tandem both in the Near East and in other parts of the world. However, such a tandem is highly dangerous for both riders:

* "Encyclopedia of Zionism and Israel," vol 2, New York, 1971, p 1262.

it is storing up "grains of anger" both against the Zionist rulers of Israel and against their transatlantic patrons, which is fraught with serious threats to these countries' interests in the Near East.

The Israeli leadership also has to take account of the fact that its persistent "playing up" to the U.S. Administration in anti-Soviet policy both in the Near East region and globally is dangerous primarily for Israel itself and for the future of Soviet-Israeli relations, the organization of which, to believe the words of Prime Minister Peres and other members of the Israeli Cabinet, is a priority task of the coalition government.

A way out of the difficulties of a political, economic, religious and ideological nature which have literally entangled Israel is not to be found on the paths of expansionism. Tel Aviv has to understand this also.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/2

VATICAN POLICIES UNDER POPE JOHN PAUL II CONSIDERED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 79-83

[Article by I. Grigulevich: "A Little About Vatican Policy"]

[Text] In 1978, contrary to a more than 400-year-old tradition whereby only Italians had been elected popes, the Polish Cardinal Karol Wojtyla, who took the name of John Paul II, was elevated to the holy seat. What policy would the Catholic Church adopt under his leadership. This was of interest not only to Catholics but the entire world press and public. Much became clear far from at once. However, today, 7 years on, certain evaluations of the new pope's activity may be made.

Has the New Pope Changed Vatican Policy?

Wojtyla had headed the Catholic Church at a critical time for it and in a complex international situation. He has differed from his predecessors in his enviable mobility. John Paul II has preferred to the sumptuous Vatican Palace the visiting of different countries, which has earned him a reputation as the "wanderer pope". He has been attracted most by Latin America: he has visited Mexico, Argentina, Brazil (twice), Venezuela, Ecuador, the Dominican Republic, Peru and even Trinidad and Tobago. He has made visits to the United States and Canada.

It is understandable why the present pope is paying such close attention to the Western Hemisphere. America has in recent years been playing an increasingly big part in the fate of Catholicism and the Papacy. After all, on the continent on both sides of the Panama Canal lives the majority, more precisely, approximately 60 percent of all Catholics, approximately half of whom in Latin America, the remainder in the United States and Canada. Brazil is not only the biggest Catholic country in the Western Hemisphere (over 100 million Catholics) but in the world. Considering the population growth rate south of the Rio Grande, it is anticipated that in the year 2000 more than half of the world's Catholics will be living here. It is natural that the entire American region is giving rise to the higher-than-usual interest of the Roman Curia. The fate not only of the Vatican itself but of world Catholicism also will depend to a considerable extent on how its Catholic majority behaves and what its attitude toward the church and its teaching is.

The pope has visited Black Africa (there, as in Turkey, he proposed the conclusion of an alliance with Islam) and also Japan, the Philippines and Hawaii, where he showered compliments on the PRC in the hope of being invited to Beijing. Nor has the pope overlooked Europe, having visited Poland (twice), Britain, Ireland, France, Switzerland, Spain and Portugal. He has also traveled much in Italy....

The election to the papal throne of Karol Wojtyla caused real euphoria in the bourgeois mass media. Propaganda has attempted to create a particular "image"--the appearance of the new pope--endowing him with the qualities of a superman--wisdom, courage, intrepidity, energy, physical superiority (swimmer, bicyclist, skier) and high intellectual qualities (the author of books and theatrical plays, singer). What, however, are the actual results of his so effervescent activity?

The pope willingly, several times a day, as a rule, speaks publicly. It is difficult to name an issue on which he has not touched. It is hardly possible to detect anything new in his numerous speeches compared with his predecessors, perhaps only a manifestly reactionary policy thrust. If we take theological issues, John Paul II has occupied a stricter position than the popes whose names he adopted following his election. The present pontiff is emphatically opposed to divorce, abortion and the use of contraceptives. In accordance with his instruction, the Vatican has once again begun to set up courts of law for theologians expressing views not to the liking of ecclesiastical conservatives. Thus the Swiss theologian Hans Kung, who rejects the tenet of an infallible pope, and a number of American, French, Belgian, Dutch and German "dissident theologians" have been publicly condemned. Even the Jesuits have found themselves accused of theological "license," while their "general," Pedro Arrupe, was dismissed (unprecedented in the history of the order).

Pope Wojtyla, who supports human rights and ideological pluralism, is, to judge by everything, fully resolved to deprive the clergymen themselves of the right to express unorthodox opinions. In 1984 he signed a new Code of the Catholic Church banning priests from engaging in political activity. But for some reason or other this code is applied only in respect of ministers of the church of the left. At the same time John Paul II officially recognized the Opus Dei organization, a kind of ecclesiastical Ku Klux Klan, whose figures cooperated with the dictator Franco in Spain, supported the fascist Salazar in Portugal and are in close communication with Pinochet in Chile.

The new pope has a lot to say about sympathy with the suffering and the poor and about social contrasts; he calls on governments to adopt measures to remove social injustices. But the church repeatedly made such appeals to the conscience of exploiters in the past also, but, as is known, it was not these appeals which changed the course of historical development. Furthermore, the Vatican itself is a partner of the biggest monopoly companies of the West and bears considerable responsibility for the very inequality which it condemns.

John Paul II also makes frequent pronouncements on questions of international politics, but it would be futile seeking in his speeches for hints at a condemnation of the aggressive militarist circles of the United States, which are responsible for the present tension in the world. Furthermore, his

repeated appeals to God to bless America and rapturous speeches during his visit to the United States as regards the American way of life make it possible to conclude that in international questions also the pope adheres to a far from new and objective position.

'Liberation Theology' and the Latin American Countries

Social conflicts intensified severely in Latin America following WWII, and the struggle of the peoples for peace throughout the world and against military adventures and blocs, in which the United States is attempting to involve them, is growing and expanding. This antiwar, anti-imperialist, antimonopoly struggle is embracing an increasingly large number of countries of the Latin American continent and the people living in them, the overwhelming majority of whom are Catholics.

Whereas about 20 years ago the participation of priests in the revolutionary process was more the exception than the rule, today many ministers are not only raising their voice increasingly vigorously against dictatorial regimes of the Pinochet type but are resolutely demanding social renewal in their countries. And what is particularly significant is that the "rebellious" church of Latin America does not have an anticommunist thrust. When the "rebels" in soutanes speak of a violation of human rights and mass repression, they mean Chile, El Salvador and Guatemala. In condemning aggression they are opposed to American interference in Latin American countries' affairs. Supporting "liberation theology,"* they are struggling against exploitation and the oppression of oligarchy and imperialism in Latin America.

The Vatican and many hierarchs of the Catholic Church condemn "liberation theology". An article by the West German Cardinal J. Ratzinger (present head of the Vatican Congregation for Doctrine of the Faith) appeared in the Italian journal 30 GIORNI** in March 1984 on the "dangers" for the church of "liberation theology".

What does the cardinal write about? He observes primarily that although prevalent mainly in the Catholic churches of Latin America, "liberation theology" has followers on other continents also--Europe, Asia and Africa. In Europe it was preceded by the "theology of revolution" and the "theology of hope," in Asia it holds particular fascination in India, on Sri Lanka, in the Philippines and on Taiwan and in Africa it is attended by so-called "African theology".

* "Liberation theology" is connected with the name of the Peruvian priest G. Gutierrez, who published in 1971 a book with such a title which has been reprinted many times in America and West Europe. In "liberation theology" the need for anti-imperialist struggle is substantiated by theological arguments. Having made its appearance, "liberation theology" rapidly began to gain supporters everywhere in Latin America. A newspaper of its supporters is published in Venezuela even entitled "People and Liberation". Continental meetings have been convened on the question of "liberation theology". It has become particularly popular in Brazil and Nicaragua. In 1984 its most prominent participants from among Nicaraguan religious figures occupying important government positions were initially cautioned in ultimatum form about the incompatibility of their calling with participation in the national liberation movement, and then proceedings were instituted against some of them by a court of congregation, and the Jesuit priest Fernando Cardenal (Nicaragua) was expelled from the order even.

** Quoted from L'UNITA, 30 October 1984.

Why, then, does Cardinal J. Ratzinger consider "liberation theology" the main danger to the belief of the church? Because it, in his opinion, "explains Christianity as the practice of liberation" and "employs Marxist analysis". Taking such a path, "liberation theology" is on the side of the ecclesiastical Christian communities and the people's church which are unwelcome to the Vatican and which Pope Wojtyla condemned during his visit to Central America.

On 4 September 1984 the official Vatican organ *L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO** published a new, this time official, document against "liberation theology". What caused such an emphatically negative Vatican position? The fact, it turns out, that its supporters "interpret insufficiently critically concepts borrowed from various currents of Marxist thought."**

The article in *L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO* caused a storm of protests all over the world. In the opinion of local Christian communities the document is based on a concept which runs counter to the provisions of the Second Vatican Council. This could only exacerbate the disagreements within local churches, where the practice and decisions of the communities and the people's church, particularly in Latin American countries, are meeting with the approval of broad strata of the top and middle clergy and believers. It is noted in the local Christian communities in Italy that the Vatican's action provides grounds for the tendentious use of the document by the champions of Reaganite policy and the most orthodox circles of the Catholic Church and could contribute to an increase in the bloodshed with which the peoples of a number of countries are paying for their liberation. For this reason the Christian communities are calling on the Italian Church to rethink this document in the course of the preparation for the upcoming ecclesiastical conference on the theme "People's Reconciliation and Community".

Commenting on the Vatican's statement on "liberation theology," Giuseppe Chiarante, member of the leadership of the Italian Communist Party, drew the following conclusion: "One is struck in the Vatican document expounded by Cardinal Ratzinger and directed against liberation theology not so much by its doctrinaire as its purely political aspect." In fact, the argument on account of the correlation of religious and social activity has been going on since the time Christianity emerged, assuming different forms at different historical stages, but has not yet been and, in all probability, will not be settled conclusively. On the other hand, the Vatican hierarchy's critical attitude toward the most progressive theological current of Latin American thought has long been known, and in the theoretical plane the document contains practically nothing new.

It is the political sharpness of the attacks which is surprising. To judge by everything, positions are changing radically. The trend which had evolved since the time of the abrupt turnabout of Pope John XXIII and the decisions of the Second Vatican Council--to expand the framework of the old Eurocentrist concept, plunge into reality and the problems of different continents and avoid identification of the church with this social and political system or the

* *L'OSSERVATORE ROMANO*, 4 September 1984.

** Ibid.

other--is manifestly receding. In condemning certain ideas the church is essentially supporting political interference.

One thing is clear. The document would appear very far from the liberal provisions of the "Pacem in Orbis" encyclical of John XXIII, as also from the in-depth analysis contained in the "Progress of the Peoples" encyclical of Paul VI, and, finally, in the more general plane, from the critical and problem-solving approach characteristic of many Vatican Council decisions. The said document emphatically cancels the expectations and hopes of millions of Catholics not only of Latin America but also of Africa and other parts of the developing world. And it primarily runs counter to the attempts to reach agreement between believers and nonbelievers for the sake of the general good and the development of human civilization which have contributed most (since the time of Pope John XXIII through the present) to the enhancement of the authority and prestige of the Catholic Church among the broad people's masses.

Catholics in the United States

The new pope's interest in the American Catholic Church--the wealthiest in the world and until recently the most "successful" from the viewpoint of the interests of the Roman Curia--is understandable. The Vatican financial empire has long been most closely connected with American monopoly capital.* The influence of the American clergy increased strongly in the central apparatus of the Vatican following WWII. More Americans than ever are working in Rome today. The star of the American Bishop Marcinkus (nicknamed the "gorilla"), in whose hands almost the entire machinery of the Curia is concentrated, was in the ascendancy under Paul VI even. Washington's ruling circles follow attentively what goes on behind the Bronze Gate in Rome. Presidents and other influential representatives of the establishment are welcome visitors of the Roman popes.

It was not fortuitous that immediately following assumption of his new office John Paul II made for the first time in history an official papal visit to the United States, which underpinned the growing ties between the Vatican and the American establishment. In the course of the visit he was not sparing of compliments about the United States, was received by then President J. Carter and delighted the transatlantic millionaires with his pronouncements on "spiritual" themes.

The trip of the Roman pope was far from straightforward. In terms of its results this visit could not have been successful for him in the region south of the Rio Grande, where over a vast territory, as far as distant Patagonia, winds of liberation, social and anti-imperialist movements are blowing more strongly with every passing day. Nor was everything in the United States itself as successful as was apparently seen from the Vatican.

It is said that the United States is the most religious country in the world. According to the information of the Gallup Institute of Public Opinion, 90

* N. Kovalskiy, "Behind the Scenes of the Vatican Economy" (MEMO, No 1, 1985).

percent of Americans believe in God and confess this religion or the other. Some 70 percent of Americans are churchgoers, and 60 percent say that religion has come to be of more interest to them than 5 years ago. However, the results of a survey for 1984 lead to a "paradoxical conclusion," the institute declares: "The significance of religion among Americans is growing, but their moral principles are weakening. An inclination toward dishonesty and deception is observed in all strata of society."* The report "Religion in America 1984," which was published by the Gallup Institute, contains information on the growth of crime, drug addiction and alcoholism, an inclination toward cheating in the business world and an increase in the incidence of divorce.**

According to data of the British journal THE ECONOMIST, of the 52 million Catholics in the United States 20 years ago, 72 percent regularly attended mass; in 1979 this figure had declined to 40 percent, and this means that there has been a corresponding decrease in the influx of money for ecclesiastical matters inasmuch as the bulk thereof is collected from offerings on Sundays and holidays.***

Although Americans are only 6.6 percent of Catholics of the whole world, they constitute 13 percent of members of male Catholic religious orders and approximately 11 percent of Catholic nuns. The 58,000 American priests constitute 14 percent of their total number. They are led by a hierarchy of 54 archbishops and 370 bishops.

American bishops are becoming increasingly involved in social, economic and political movements, and there is an increase in the number of priests who have rebelled against Washington's high-handed interference in the internal affairs of countries of the American continent and against the White House's military strategy. More than 300 Catholic bishops of the American Church condemned the government's foreign policy, military hysteria and provocations in respect of Nicaragua. They issued a message against nuclear war which says: "Peace is an essential condition for creating a truly humane life for everyone everywhere."****

The pope has not confined himself to admonishments in this connection. He ordered an investigation of the activity of Archbishop of Seattle R. Hunthausen, a well-known liberal American Catholic prelate. The Vatican was seriously angered by the archbishop's statement that he intended withholding half of his federal income tax, which, according to his calculations, goes on military spending. The activity of yet another ecclesiastical liberal, Bishop of Richmond (Virginia) W. Sullivan, was similarly investigated. In 1984 a special commission was set up under the leadership of Archbishop of San Francisco J. Quinn designed to facilitate the renewal of religious orders.

The U.S. President, of course, declared himself to be a true believer and even declared 1983 in the United States "Bible Year" and 28 May 1984 a "Day of

* N. Kovalskiy, "Behind the Scenes of the Vatican Economy" (MEMO No 1, 1985).

** See "Religion in America," Princeton, 1984, p 1

*** THE ECONOMIST, 14 April 1984, p 23.

**** NEW WORLD REVIEW, July-August 1983, p 25.

Prayer for Peace". The U.S. political calendar has been supplemented recently with such innovations as a "Day for Prayer for Poland," "National Day of Concern for the Needy," Women's Equality Day" and so forth. The President sees Pope Wojtyla, consults him in connection with the sanctions against "unrepentant" Poland and hopes that the pope, insisting on the resignation of minister-priests from the Nicaraguan Government, will help him rein in the Sandinistas. However, "Nicaragua," Massimo Conti writes in the Italian journal PANORAMA,* "is merely the face-up card in the game begun by these figures." In practice this is a convenient pretext for calling to order both the broad masses of Latin American Catholics under the influence of "liberation theology" and Catholics in the United States, who are increasingly often in disagreement with both the pope and Reagan.

The differences between Catholic believers and the church in the United States are becoming increasingly acute. American Catholics, PANORAMA points out, continue to criticize the administration for interference in Nicaragua's affairs. The particularity of Catholic dissent, a Washington theologian says, is that everyone is demanding that the church be more liberal and democratic and less Roman. Religious and political motives with a common anti-authoritarian denominator are closely interwoven in Catholics' dissent. It is therefore obvious that both the White House and the pope are interested, albeit for different reasons, in curbing this dissent before it gets completely out of control.

Why, however, do the U.S. Administration and Wojtyla attach such significance to American Catholics? Mention was made at the start of the article of the wealth of the American Catholic Church, whose money goes to finance clericals' activity in the developing countries and to maintain a number of important Vatican institutions. At presidential elections American Catholics are a powerful pressure group which can manipulate millions of votes of Italian-Americans and persons of Latin American origin in the United States. It is this that the White House and the pope are taking into consideration.

As far as banning priests from participation in political activity is concerned, this, in the words of V.I. Lenin, is outright hypocrisy since "the clergy has always participated in politics surreptitiously."** Thus the White House justifies its anti-Soviet policy with references to Christian morality, declaring that the "Russians rely on an ideology which does not recognize God and which is, consequently, amoral." Playing on people's feelings has always been a characteristic of the U.S. ruling elite. But never before has the onslaught of empty words reached such a level as under the present administration.

Nonetheless, the dodges aimed at luring Americans into the web of cheap demagogic are missing the target. As public opinion polls testify, the majority of Americans supports peace, the freeze of nuclear arsenals proposed by the Soviet Union and the restoration of good relations with the USSR. The White House has to reckon with this. How to get around the fact that U.S.

* See PANORAMA, 27 August 1984, p 43.

** V.I. Lenin, "Complete Works," vol 21, p 470.

foreign policy, as the well-known commentator J. Reston put it, is currently in the hands of a president who known nothing about history, human suffering and poverty is becoming an increasingly serious problem. Whence the White House's efforts to disguise the essence of the aggressive adventurist policy it is pursuing with fraudulent phrases. Simultaneously a new institution was created in Washington in 1981--the Institute for the Study of Religion and Democracy--which is designed to conduct a struggle against churches criticizing R. Reagan's policy.

An event occurred in May 1983 which showed distinctly to which god the Republican administration prays. Representatives of various religious organizations had come to the U.S. Congress building on 23 May. They had decided to mark the "day of Pentacost" (a date of the church calendar) with appeals for a halt to the arms race, the prevention of nuclear catastrophe and the preservation of peace. The police arrested 242 participants in the meeting, among whom were many priests. The press reported that those arrested faced 6 months behind bars and a \$500 fine each. This is how Washington organizes mutual relations with religious ministers and believers.

Understandably, the White House needs believers who will readily seize on statements that the supporters of a nuclear freeze are "nincompoops" deceived by the USSR (the head of the administration expressed himself in such terms at a congress of evangelists in Orlando, Florida). But what to do with the fathers of the church who reject the mere idea that a nuclear war may be limited, contained or won? After all, such a concept cancels out Reagan's doctrine according to which the creation, *inter alia*, of the MX missile is capable of helping "fight a nuclear war and prevent it growing into a protracted nuclear conflict."

"Communists," the Soviet scholar N.A. Kovalskiy writes, "are far from idealizing religious circles. They are aware that there are many enemies of dialogue and cooperation with the communists there. G. Marchais' report at the congress observed in this connection that 'the church hierarchy is creating many obstacles to progress on this path. The statements of Pope John Paul II on major issues of social life and political problems run counter to the liberation aspirations of our time'."* The communist movement evaluates realistically the possibilities of cooperation of all antiwar and antimonopoly forces in a situation where imperialism has mounted an offensive against the vital interests of the broad working people's masses and against peace and socialism. Communists see such cooperation as an important factor of man's further development along the path of peace and social progress.

The leaders of the Soviet Union have always adopted an attentive attitude toward any peace-loving initiatives, from whomsoever they emanate. So it was in 1984 with the messages of the municipality of the Italian city of Assisi and the Franciscan Order and in 1985 with the appeal of the cochairmen of the consultative meeting of representatives of Christian churches, Dr E. Post (United States) and Dr K. Toth (Hungary), to which the leader of the Soviet state responded.

* KOMMUNIST No 13, 1984, p 108.

The Soviet people have advocated and continue to advocate cooperation with all peace-loving forces of the planet, including religious circles, which, in our opinion, could play a considerable part in delivering mankind from the nuclear threat.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850
CSO: 1816/2

SURVEY OF WORLD EVENTS JUNE-SEPTEMBER 1985

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 90-109

[International roundup by B. Bolotin, O. Ivanova, V. Rasnitsyn, N. Streltsova: "Current Problems of World Politics"]

[Excerpts] The past summer the peoples of our planet commemorated a memorable date--the 40th anniversary of the smashing of militarist Japan and the end of WWII. The defeat of Hitler Germany's ally, which followed just a few months after its surrender, was possible thanks to the entry into the war of the Soviet Union, which made a decisive contribution to the rout of the Kwantung Army.

The victory over militarist Japan led to a further weakening of the forces of world imperialism. It created favorable conditions for the upsurge of the national liberation movement in countries of the Far East and Southeast Asia, which culminated in socialist revolutions in Vietnam, Korea and China.

In August mankind commemorated another date also--the 40th anniversary of the tragedy of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which were the victims of atomic bombing. The barbaric act of the American military, which was not dictated by any military necessity, proclaimed to the world that across the Atlantic people had embarked on the preparation of a new war, even more devastating in its consequences. The purpose of this act was obvious from the very outset: to intimidate the USSR and, employing a policy of nuclear blackmail, impose on the postwar world a Pax Americana. Such calculations were not to be--the United States' nuclear monopoly did not last long. But Washington strategists were successful in one thing: the nuclear arms race which they unleashed has brought mankind to a dangerous boundary.

The growing threat of nuclear catastrophe demands persistent and decisive actions to overcome it. The Soviet state's entire activity in the international arena is subordinated to tackling this historic task. Naturally, in the disturbing situation which has been created priority significance is attached to the problem of an improvement in Soviet-American relations: the USSR and the United States have a special responsibility for the fate of peace. "The main question which we must answer," M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, declared in his responses to the American TIME Magazine, "is whether we are at last ready to recognize that there is no

other way than to live with one another in the world and whether we are prepared to switch our mentality and mode of action from a warlike to a peaceful track. ...As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we answer this question in the affirmative." War will not come from the Soviet Union, we will never start it, the Soviet leader emphasized. Our people have far-reaching creative plans, and to realize them they need peace.

1. The Peaceable Affairs and Concerns of the Socialist Community

The present year of 1985 is in many respects a turning point for the socialist countries. It is the final year of the 5-year plans for the CEMA countries (with the exception of Poland, where in connection with the special circumstances a 3-year plan for 1983-1985 was adopted). It is the year of preparation for the regular congresses of almost all the fraternal parties, which will be held at the start of next year and which in terms of their significance will occupy a special place in the life of the peoples of the socialist community. The congresses will have to outline the specific tasks and paths of the socialist states' socioeconomic development not only for the next 5 years, up to 1990, but also through the end of the century and, in many cases, for the longer term even.

As we can see, the socialist states retain the lead in terms of growth rate, although their superiority over the capitalist states in this respect is not expressed as sharply as in the past. Whence it does not follow, of course, that the slowing of economic growth which has occurred in the CEMA countries in recent years has been caused by some global, objective factors common to the entire world economy irrespective of the socioeconomic nature of the systems incorporated therein. Yet such views are often expressed in the West by both the enemies and friends of socialism. By the first to absolve capitalism of the responsibility for the deprivations of many millions of casualties of the current crisis. By the second to find some force majeure which is insuperable even for socialism and thereby justify the slowing of development, the high rate of which was perceived even recently by our friends as something immanently inherent in the socialist economic system.

Real socialism does not need such explanations and justifications. Speaking of the fact that certain difficulties had come to be perceived in our economic development as of the start of the 1970's, M.S. Gorbachev emphasized in his speech at the meeting in the CPSU Central Committee on questions of an acceleration of scientific-technical progress: "The main reason is the fact that we have failed to opportunely display persistence in the reorganization of structural policy, the forms and methods of management and the very psychology of economic activity." In other words, not everything has been done to remove the certain contradiction which arose between the gigantic possibilities of real socialism materialized in the economic potential which had been created and the degree of their use and between the powerful production forces and the conditions of their functioning, which are determined by the economic mechanism which has taken shape and which is operating.

The material of the CPSU Central Committee April (1985) Plenum and subsequent speeches of M.S. Gorbachev precisely reflected the main task confronting the Soviet people: an acceleration of socioeconomic development. It is necessary for the solution of such problems as a rise in the Soviet people's living standard

(by way of the implementation of a set of measures embracing an increase in wages, pensions and family benefits), an increase in the production of food and other consumer goods and services, a new development of housing construction, a general improvement in the living conditions and, correspondingly, the health of Soviet people and an improvement in health care, education, science and culture.

Colossal material resources are needed to tackle these tasks--under the most complex foreign policy conditions, what is more, requiring that the country's defense capability be maintained at the due level. They can be obtained only by an acceleration of production growth. It is understandably a question not of a simple increase in the volume of the manufactured product--we have been taught sufficiently by bitter experience of the growth of quantity to the detriment of quality. An unwavering improvement in the quality and soundness of the products together with an increase in the quantity thereof has been declared by the party a matter not only of worker but of national honor.

The decisive lever of the essential acceleration of socioeconomic development can ultimately be only scientific-technical progress. Without full use of the achievements of science and technology the accelerated growth of production under conditions where the growth of labor, mineral, energy and other production resources is slowing is simply inconceivable. The time is not far off when only scientific-technical progress will be able to secure an intensification of production compensating for the exhaustion or weakening of extensive factors of growth. However, until that time much, very much, as emphasized in M.S. Gorbachev's speeches, may be afforded by the strict institution of order. It is a question, of course, not only of proper labor discipline. The reference is also to an improvement in planning at all its levels and the surmounting of departmental and localist trends and barriers impeding the rational territorial location of the production forces and the optimization of production relations between enterprises.

Bringing order to bear is also an immediate goal of the improvement in the economic mechanism on which the party is working in the spirit of the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee November (1982) Plenum and whose realization is now recognized as brooking no delay. As emphasized in a number of party documents, we need not individual improvements but the comprehensive reorganization of the economic mechanism providing for the harmonious correspondence of the production forces and production relations of real socialism and creating the optimum conditions for the further unfolding of the great socioeconomic advantages of our system.

The new economic mechanism will be characterized by the organic combination of the centralized planning of the basic directions of development subordinated to the requirements and priorities of society and enterprises' considerable independence in the choice of the most efficient and, perhaps, profitable paths of plan fulfillment. The significance of the work of the central planning authorities will even increase, but its accent will shift from prescriptions as to where and when this product or the other should be manufactured to the planning of the optimum proportions and confirmation of economic levers--norms stimulating the rational activity of enterprises and sectors directly interesting each collective and each worker in the manufacture of products needed by society given the minimal outlays within the due specified time and of due quality.

Socialist ownership of the means of production was and remains the permanent economic basis of our society. But use of the means of production belonging to all of society by the collectives of enterprises which have acquired responsible possession of it will become more proprietorial and efficient. It is necessary only that the connection between the end results of production and the well-being of each be clear and indisputable and that it not be refracted through the prism of selfish departmental interests.

Understandably, the functioning of an economic mechanism oriented toward the optimization of plans and their fulfillment has nothing in common with the action of market spontaneity (even regulated within certain limits by the bourgeois state).

Nonetheless, any step of ours toward such a reorganization of the economic mechanism causes maliciously gleeful talk in the West about the fact that in attempting to solve its problems socialism is turning to capitalist methods of management. Sovietologists' predictions concerning the alleged inevitability of our slide toward the notorious "market socialism" multiply. And the seemingly respectable British weekly THE ECONOMIST (6 July 1985) went as far as to suggest that the Soviet Union intended granting enterprises complete freedom of action in the spirit of the "Erhard reforms" which laid the foundation of the "West German miracle" in the 1950's-1960's. Such commentators should be a little more concerned for their professional reputation and not display so manifestly complete a lack of knowledge about the processes occurring in our economy.

The tasks confronting the socialist economy may be tackled better and more thoroughly only by the joint efforts of the entire community and a comprehensive improvement in economic cooperation between the fraternal states. It is inexpedient even for such a giant as the Soviet Union to develop and manufacture by its own forces all the products which it needs--whether traditional consumer products or ultramodern flexible automated production systems. As far as the other CEMA countries are concerned, for them work for the entire "common socialist market" and the development of production cooperation with the community partners is essentially the sole opportunity for specializing production and transferring it to the mass, large-series manufacture of products, without which under current conditions it is impossible to hope to secure high efficiency.

Life confirms again and again how timely was the CEMA countries' adoption in 1971 of the Comprehensive Program of Socialist Economic Integration.

Large-scale decisions on these questions were confirmed, as is known, by the top-level CEMA economic conference in June 1984 in Moscow. The 38th (extraordinary) meeting of the CEMA session, which was convened shortly afterward, and, at the end of 1984, the 39th meeting of the CEMA session in Havana were devoted to translating the general political decisions adopted at that time into the language of working documents.

How are these fundamental decisions being realized? Has everything been done to bring cooperation among the CEMA countries fully into line with the scale of the impending tasks? These questions were thoroughly examined at the latest,

40th, meeting of the CEMA Session held 25-27 June in Warsaw. The participants in the meeting--and they were represented mainly by heads of government--were of the unanimous opinion that the decisions of the economic conference were being implemented unswervingly. Purposeful work is being performed in the community countries to remove all the factors complicating fulfillment of the long-term integration programs. Uniform standards are being developed for products manufactured in accordance with agreements on production cooperation and subsequently delivered to other CEMA countries. These standards are being tightened, ensuring the manufactured products' correspondence to the level and demands of the world market. Clearly, only if the community states manufacture products, including modern "science-intensive" equipment, which are not inferior to the best Western models will it be possible to reduce to a rational minimum the placing of orders for such equipment outside of CEMA. In turn, this will reduce the need to export the highest-quality products to the West in payment for imports. Any step forward in this direction will strengthen the socialist states' invulnerability in respect of any imperialist "sanctions" and will contribute to a rise in the technical level of economic efficiency of social production.

Work is under way in all the fraternal countries on an improvement in the economic mechanism, and economic experiments, including those which are of a very large scale in terms of the range of enterprises and sectors which they encompass, are being conducted. Special attention has been paid here to bringing closer together the status of the direct partners in economic integration--the socialist enterprises and associations--and the powers and competence of their leaders. Direct relations between enterprises of all the CEMA countries (they ultimately ensure the necessary promptitude in the realization of decisions adopted at a higher level) may be extensively developed only under conditions where the enterprises which are a part of these relations are in an equal position, enjoy equal rights and bear equal responsibility.

The decisions of the economic conference establishing a new procedure of the community countries' participation in the financing and installation of integration facilities whose products are intended to satisfy the requirements of several states are being implemented unswervingly. The direct financial participation of the countries which are the prospective recipients of these products creates the optimum conditions for the expansion of the corresponding production capacity within a community framework and is bringing CEMA closer to self-sufficiency in respect of many important types of energy carrier and raw material for industrial processing. The barriers connected with the limited nature of the investment capital of a country whose mineral resources are to be developed are removed. The differences in the recovery times of capital investments in enterprises working for the "common socialist market," as also the differences in the capital-intensiveness of products of the individual states entering this market, are reduced to a minimum. All this represents the actual, tangible foundations of the further intensification and expansion of the CEMA countries' cooperation in the sphere of economic integration.

The new financing procedure has already been applied in the construction of the Krivoy Rog Mining-Concentrating Works, a considerable proportion of whose products will go to the fraternal states' metallurgical enterprises. The laying of the power lines from the Khmelnitskaya AES to Poland and from the

South Ukraine AES to Romania and Bulgaria is being financed and preparations are under way for the installation of the transcontinental gas pipeline from Yamburg to the USSR's western border, whence branches will run to the countries participating in the construction of this main line, on these same terms.

The 40th meeting of the CEMA Session examined and approved the course of preparation of an interstate Comprehensive Program of Scientific-Technical Progress for the next 15-20 years. In order to ensure the speediest unification of the community's efforts in the most important and priority areas of the development of science and technology a general agreement was signed in the course of the session on multilateral cooperation in the development of flexible automated production systems and the organization of their specialized and cooperative manufacture. This agreement will be a part of the above-mentioned Comprehensive Program as an inalienable component thereof. The latter also incorporates the basic provisions of long-term programs for the development of economic and scientific-technical cooperation up to the year 2000 prepared by the council's participants on a bilateral basis. Eighteen such bilateral programs had been signed by 1 September 1985. The Soviet Union, in particular, already has cooperation programs with all the CEMA countries except Romania.

The question of optimization of the structure of energy consumption within CEMA, which is extremely important for ensuring energy supply, was examined also. A policy of the extensive development of the construction of nuclear power and thermal plants and the maximum substitution for liquid fuel oil of natural gas, as motor fuel included, was approved.

As at the top-level economic conference also, the question of accelerating the "pulling up" of Vietnam, Cuba and Mongolia to the level of economic development of the European CEMA countries attracted great attention. The successes of these fraternal states in economic building are indisputable. In the period 1970-1984 the manufacture of industrial products in Mongolia increased by a factor of 3.3 and on Cuba by a factor of 2.6 (by a factor of 2.1 in the community as a whole). Nonetheless, their lagging behind the European CEMA countries in terms of the level of economic development remains very considerable. It was decided to return at the next CEMA Session meeting to the question of an acceleration of the growth of the economy of Vietnam, Cuba and Mongolia and, accordingly, the equalization of economic development levels within the CEMA framework. The more rapidly the process of equalization of the CEMA countries in terms of economic development proceeds, the stronger will be the magnetic force of the "socialist model" for hundreds of millions of people inhabiting Asian, African and Latin American countries. After all, the lagging in this part of the world behind the developed capitalist states not only is not diminishing but is even growing.

The endeavor to expand comprehensive economic cooperation between CEMA and the developing countries, primarily those which have opted for a socialist orientation of their development, was emphasized in Warsaw (a graphic manifestation of this was the presence at the meeting itself of observers from Angola, Afghanistan, the PDRY, Laos, Mozambique, Nicaragua and Ethiopia).

The CEMA Session confirmed the proposal concerning the establishment of contacts and the development of cooperation with the EEC which was expressed in a letter of the CEMA Executive Committee to the chairman of the European Communities Commission (EC).

The work of the 40th meeting of the CEMA Session was commented on extensively throughout the world. Although there were many malevolent comments in the West, it was not they which predominated. The persistence with which the socialist community avails itself of each occasion to emphasize its invariable devotion to peace and peaceful creation won for us many new friends.

True to their policy of a normalization of relations with the PRC, the CEMA countries have recently made significant efforts to expand economic relations with the PRC via channels of foreign trade, production and scientific-technical cooperation, cultural and sports exchange and so forth. As a result there has been a considerable increase in Soviet-Chinese trade, for example, those turnover rose from R490 million in 1983 to R980 million in 1984. The visit to the PRC at the end of 1984 by I.V. Arkhipov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and the return visit to Moscow this July by Yao Yilin, vice premier of the PRC State Council, laid a good foundation for the further development of economic relations between the two countries. Thus the agreements which were signed provide for a growth of Soviet-Chinese trade turnover by 1990 to R3 billion, which is almost double the 1985 level. Compared with the 1970 level, if reckoned in constant prices, it will have increased almost 25-fold! We would point out, however, that in order to have a reliable scale for judgment in 1960 commodity turnover between the USSR and the PRC in current prices constituted R4.5 billion, that is, 1.5 times more than that envisaged for 1990. We are obviously right at the start of the difficult path toward the complete normalization of economic relations with China. But, as Soviet leaders have declared repeatedly, our country is prepared to cover its part of the path rapidly and resolutely. It is a question of what kind of strides the PRC will take.

The main items of Soviet exports to the PRC are parts and components for equipment which was supplied by the Soviet Union in the first period of modernization and development of China's national economy, means of transport (including passenger aircraft), rolled ferrous metal products, raw material and chemicals. China, in turn, supplies us with consumer goods which are quite well known in our country: fruit (particularly for the Soviet Far East and Far North), knitwear, cloth, clothing and footwear and also certain types of raw material for industrial processing.

Besides the trade agreement, an agreement was signed in the course of Yao Yilin's visit on economic and technical cooperation. It is well known that over 200 industrial enterprises constituting the backbone of the PRC's socialist industry were built in people's China in the 1950's with the USSR's material-technical assistance and the participation of Soviet workers and specialists. In 30 years a certain proportion of the equipment of these enterprises has naturally worn out and now requires modernizing or replacing. In accordance with the above-mentioned agreement, the Soviet Union will help the PRC in the next 5-6 years modernize 17 and build 7 new facilities in key sectors of industry.

Important agreements on an expansion of trade and scientific-technical cooperation have also been signed between the PRC and European CEMA members: the CSSR, GDR, Poland and Hungary.

2. In the Pivotal Direction of the Struggle for Peace

While putting forward complex and critical tasks of an acceleration of Soviet society's socioeconomic development the CPSU is conducting a constant struggle to secure the necessary external conditions for reaching the charted frontiers. This is tackling a problem of a truly worldwide nature. For there is now for no people a more essential, more important question than ensuring the primary right of each person--the right to life--as declared from the platform of the 26th CPSU Congress. And today, on the threshold of the next congress, Soviet communists may say with pride: the credit for the fact that for 40 years mankind has succeeded in avoiding world wars belongs to the Communist Party and the Soviet state and the USSR's active peace-loving policy in the international arena.

The USSR embodies its firm will to peace in precise and constructive proposals and deeds. In the last 4½ years alone our country has presented more than 80 initiatives on key problems of world politics, and, were it not for the West's refusal to heed the command of wisdom, the world would today be truly peaceful. The Soviet Union's activity in the international arena in the past months also was subordinated to bringing nearer this noble goal.

Guided by a sense of responsibility for the fate of peace, our country has not slackened efforts aimed at the solution of the set of problems on the agenda of the Soviet-American negotiations in Geneva: a halt to the arms race on earth and the prevention thereof in space, a limitation of and reduction in nuclear arsenals and a strengthening of strategic stability.

The Soviet Union came to the negotiations with the firm intention of seeking fair and honest accords on the entire range of problems to be discussed. As is known, in order to facilitate their achievement the USSR announced the unilateral imposition as of 7 April of a moratorium on the deployment of its intermediate-range missiles and halted the implementation of other retaliatory measures caused by the deployment in Europe of the new American missiles. The proposal put forward by the Soviet Union in connection with the start of the second round of negotiations concerning the establishment for the whole time of the negotiations of a moratorium on the creation, research into, testing and deployment of strike space weapons and also on a freeze of strategic offensive arms was also dictated by an endeavor to create a favorable atmosphere in Geneva. Furthermore, the USSR presented the initiative that upon the establishment of a moratorium the two sides agree to submit at the negotiations within a certain time, 1-2 months, say, their specific proposals on all the questions under discussion, including the levels to which they would be prepared to reduce strategic offensive arms, on condition, of course, of a ban on strike space arms.

Thus in the course of the two rounds of the Geneva negotiations (the second ended in July) our country demonstrated a truly constructive approach to a solution of the most important present-day problem and a sincere interest in the achievement of mutually acceptable accords.

Unfortunately, this cannot be said of the other side--the United States--whose position is blocking progress in Geneva. Having adopted a policy of achieving military superiority over the USSR, the United States, as again shown by the second round of negotiations, is in fact using them as a smokescreen for the acceleration of gigantic militarist programs, including the "star wars" program.

It is cramped for the aggressive designs of American imperialism within the framework of existing accords. This was demonstrated graphically, in particular, this June, when, coming very close to the level of nuclear strategic arms stipulated by the SALT II Treaty, Washington was ready to cast aside the provisions of this important agreement. True, considering the mood which exists both in the United States itself and among America's allies and in the world as a whole, the administration deemed an outright renunciation of its treaty commitments a risky business. In his statement on 10 June the head of the White House promised to abide by the terms of the treaty. But he simultaneously made it understood that the United States might revise its decision in the future. In fact Washington has long been pursuing a policy of undermining the Soviet-American SALT II Treaty.

The question arises: on what does Washington intend reaching agreement in Geneva if even the limitations which exist currently are unacceptable to it?

The present U.S. Administration is the sole administration in many years which is declining in practice any agreements with the Soviet Union aimed at reducing the threat of war and improving the international atmosphere. The latest testimony to this was Washington's attitude toward the exceptionally important initiative of the USSR presented at the end of July. On the eve of the 40th anniversary of the barbaric crime of the American military against mankind--the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki--M.S. Gorbachev announced our country's decision to suspend unilaterally as of 6 August all nuclear explosions. The moratorium is in effect until 1 January 1986, but it could be extended if the United States, for its part, also refrains from carrying out nuclear explosions. The Soviet Union called on the U.S. Government to join in the moratorium. Presenting the new foreign policy initiative aimed at removing the threat of nuclear war and strengthening peace, the USSR was guided by an endeavor to break the vicious circle of the arms race. After all, new kinds and types of weapons of mass annihilation are developed in the course of testing. In other words, a halt to testing is a realistic path toward the elimination of nuclear arsenals inasmuch as if the modernization of the existing nuclear weapons systems is impossible, they will gradually lose their effectiveness and will ultimately wither away.

Such a prospect corresponds to the cherished aspirations of all peoples, to which the broad support for the new Soviet initiative by the world community testifies. Millions of people on all continents have evaluated the USSR's decision to impose a moratorium on all nuclear explosions as the latest manifestation of our country's sense of responsibility for the fate of mankind. Official Washington had a different response. Without daring to reject the Soviet initiative outright and thereby demonstrate for the umpteenth time to the whole world its reluctance to tackle in practice problems of limiting and halting the arms race, the United States began to invent various dodges to rid

itself of the USSR's appeal for its example to be followed. Initially, as repeatedly in the past, Washington hastened to declare the Soviet proposal "propaganda," then it came out with its own "initiative," proposing that the USSR send its observers to the next American tests, which were timed, incidentally, to coincide with the 40th anniversary of the Hiroshima and Nagasaki tragedy (this can be called nothing other than the height of cynicism!). Then under the pressure of world, including American, public opinion President Reagan was finally forced to set forth the United States' position on the question of a halt to nuclear explosions. However, instead of a clear and, as all peace-loving people hoped, positive reply to the Soviet proposal to join in the moratorium, he in fact rejected it, declaring that there could be no question of any moratorium on the part of the United States until it had fully completed its testing program. According to an American press report citing military experts, the Pentagon needs these tests, in particular, to create the new Midgetman first-strike missile and implement the "strategic defense initiative".

The plans being hatched in Washington for the militarization of space and the actual steps being taken in this direction have confronted mankind with the choice: either space will produce increasingly tangible fruit for an improvement in the living conditions of inhabitants of the planet or it will become a source of mortal danger. The question is one of immediacy. The United States is already performing practical work on the creation of strike space weapons. In September the Pentagon plans to test an antisatellite weapon, which specialists regard as the transition to practical realization of the program for the militarization of space. If this process is not stopped, the arms race will assume even greater dimensions and intensity in all areas.

Proceeding from the seriousness and urgency of this problem, the Soviet Union proposed that the agenda of the IX General Assembly 40th Session include the question "International Cooperation in the Peaceful Conquest of Space Under the Conditions of its Nonmilitarization". The USSR's proposal provides, *inter alia*, for the implementation of a set of measures which would contribute to the unification of various states' efforts in the peaceful exploration of space and the use of space technology for the good of all mankind, including all-around assistance in this sphere to the developing countries. For coordination of the basic directions of cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space the USSR proposes the convening of a governmental international conference with the participation of states possessing major space potential. Such a conference would also examine the question of the creation of a world space organization for international cooperation in this sphere. "The Soviet Union is convinced that space--the common property of mankind--should be put not at the service of war but at the service of peace and security and the economic and social progress of all peoples," the Soviet proposal emphasized. And this position corresponds fully to the USSR's approach to the problem of preventing an arms race in space, a halt thereof on Earth and the removal of the threat of thermonuclear catastrophe.

3. Europe--Confrontation or Detente?

On the frontier of July and August the world community commemorated extensively the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe--a most important event in the postwar life of our continent. Its

permanent significance for the fate of Europe and the whole world has been confirmed as convincingly as could be by the past decade.

The Moscow Treaty between the USSR and the FRG, whose 15-year term was completed in August, contributed to a considerable extent to the development of this process. The treaty was a creation of detente and, in turn, lent important impetus to this salutary process. This treaty, M.S. Gorbachev observed, opened the way to productive cooperation between European capitalist and socialist countries, between East and West. Thanks to the treaty, the FRG gained an opportunity to participate more independently and assertively in international affairs and in efforts aimed at ensuring security and cooperation in Europe and throughout the world. Relying on the spirit of partnership ensuing from the Moscow Treaty, it could continue to make its contribution to the cause of detente. It is this that is demanded by the majority of West Germans, who share the treaty's noble goals. Such sentiments were expressed well by W. Brandt, whose signature is on the document: "Despite all the difficulties of world politics, it has justified itself as a factor of stability and cooperation guaranteeing peace. It has ceased to be questioned even by those who once fought against it. It operates...."

The development of East-West relations begun by the Moscow Treaty culminated in the signing of a whole system of treaties and agreements in Europe between countries with different social systems. These efforts were crowned by the signing of the Helsinki Final Act.

True, the all-European process subsequently developed by no means smoothly. There were periods when it seemed that the policy of Washington and some of its NATO allies would create insurmountable obstacles to the continuation of detente. The buildup of military power aimed at disrupting the East-West military-strategic balance and the attempts at flagrant pressure on and interference in the internal affairs of the socialist countries are fundamentally contrary to the demands of the Final Act. The attempts by certain NATO circles to question the present political-territorial realities on the continent, cancel out the Yalta and Potsdam agreements and undermine the very treaty basis of detente are also being reflected negatively in the political climate in Europe.

Nonetheless, 10 years after the signing of the Final Act it may confidently be said that, despite the serious tests, detente has survived. Thanks to the efforts of the USSR and its allies and the forbearance and firm will which they have displayed, it has been possible to preserve the structure of detente and the connecting links in East-West relations. And today it is Europe--the continent where detente was conceived--that can and must play an active part in channeling international relations from confrontation and military opposition to good-neighborliness and cooperation. The principles contained in the Final Act adopted 10 years ago serve as a good basis for this.

East-West business relations became the material fabric of cooperation in Europe. Despite the efforts of the enemies of detente, transatlantic primarily, who attempted to involve the West European states in the implementation of a variety of "sanctions" and embargoes, commercial-economic cooperation on the continent has developed successfully, as a whole. According to EC data, in the period 1975-1983 commodity turnover between the West European countries and the CEMA

states grew from \$41 billion to \$74 billion, that is, practically doubled. The growth rate of commodity turnover between the USSR and certain West European countries, primarily the FRG, is even more impressive. In the past 10 years the volume of Soviet-West German trade has increased many times over and in 1984 constituted over R7.5 billion. Other major partners of the USSR in this region are Finland, Italy, France, Great Britain, Austria and Belgium.

East-West commercial-economic cooperation is characterized not only by the growth of commodity turnover but also by profound qualitative changes. The sectors determining technical progress are becoming the objects thereof: electronics, power engineering, chemistry, machine-tool building and others. The successful construction of the Siberia-West Europe gas pipeline, which has opened new prospects of East-West cooperation, may serve as an example of cooperation in the energy sphere, on an all-European scale, moreover.

Unfortunately, for the reasons mentioned earlier it has not been possible to extend detente to the military sphere, furthermore, the situation has deteriorated here in this respect: as a result of the deployment in West Europe of the new American first-strike missiles the level of military confrontation on the continent has risen considerably, which is also being reflected in the general political climate in Europe and the world as a whole.

The return of international relations to the channel of detente insistently demands that detente be underpinned by political measures aimed at reducing the threat of conflict on the continent. Implementation of the proposals submitted by the socialist countries at the Stockholm Conference on Confidence-Building Measures and Security and Disarmament in Europe for the conclusion by the participants in the All-European Conference of a treaty on the mutual nonuse of military force and the maintenance of relations of peace could contribute to this to a large extent. The pivotal provision of such a treaty would be an undertaking not to be the first to use either nuclear or conventional arms, consequently, to use military force in general. Summing up the work of the latest session of the conference, which ended in July, it may be noted that, despite the obstructionist actions of the U.S. delegation, the socialist states' proposal was the leading topic of discussion at the Stockholm forum. Besides the socialist states, the neutral and nonaligned states and also Greece, Spain, Italy and France support the adoption of an international commitment on the mutual nonuse of force.

The working documents presented by the socialist countries at the conference on limiting the scale of military exercises in Europe and notification of large-scale army, navy and air force exercises and also large-scale troop movements and transfers imparted a new direction to the discussion of military confidence-building measures. It is no secret that the holding of exercises and maneuvers with the participation of large-scale forces could bring about a growth of tension and create a threat to peoples' security. Sometimes, as can be seen from the example of certain NATO maneuvers, they assume such significant proportions that it is difficult to distinguish them from the deployment of troops for the start of combat operations.

The measures proposed by the USSR and its allies are aimed at removing the factors capable of giving rise to suspicion and tension. The socialist countries' proposals are largely consonant with the positions of the neutral and nonaligned

states, the majority of which advocates a limitation of the dimensions of military exercises and that confidence-building measures extend to the activity of such strike forces as the air force and the navy. But it is this which the NATO countries would like to avoid.

They are also occupying just as unconstructive a position in respect of the socialist states' proposals concerning the freeing of European territory from chemical weapons. And this position is easily explained: the United States is speeding up a program of the production of chemical weapons, including their most dangerous variety--binary. In June Congress approved the requisite appropriations. Furthermore, as if sneering at world public opinion, the decision to produce binary weapons was adopted precisely at a time when in Geneva negotiations are continuing on the elaboration of a convention on the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons. As can be seen, the Pentagon would like to convert Europe into a theater not only of nuclear but also chemical warfare.

The question of a mutual reduction in armed forces and armaments in Central Europe being discussed at the Vienna talks is directly related to ensuring European security. Unfortunately, the last, 36th, round of talks brought no progress. Two fundamentally different approaches clash in Vienna, as before. Proceeding from the approximate equivalence of the military groupings which has actually evolved in the center of Europe, the socialist countries proposed a mutual reduction in armed forces and armaments on an equal numerical or equal percentage basis. This proposal affords a real opportunity for the achievement of an accord. The success of the talks in Vienna will depend on whether the NATO countries finally make a really constructive response instead of conducting an endless "numerical" discussion.

The dependable pathway toward the strengthening of security in Europe, the Soviet Union believes, is the continent's complete liberation from nuclear weapons, both intermediate-range and tactical. The socialist countries are prepared to examine any proposal most seriously--within the framework of the negotiations or outside of them--if it really pursues the aim of strengthening security on the continent. Thus, for example, the socialist countries adopted an understanding attitude toward Swedish Prime Minister O. Palme's proposal concerning the creation in the center of Europe of a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons.

True to the spirit of Helsinki, the USSR and its allies seek the elimination of political-psychological factors of the military threat, which is impossible without a deepening of mutual understanding and respect for one another's values and views. Yet many propaganda actions of the Western mass media, as, equally, the speeches of official representatives of the capitalist states, are manifestly sustained in a spirit of "psychological warfare". It is sufficient to mention the subject of the "violation" of human rights in the socialist countries which is constantly being blown up in the West.

The socialist countries have no reason to avoid serious discussion of the human rights issue. Furthermore, such discussion will inevitably turn against the instigators of malevolent campaigns about imaginary human rights violations under the conditions of real socialism. A meeting of human rights experts held

in Ottawa in the summer showed yet again who in deed and not in word supports guaranteed human rights. It was the delegations of the United States and a number of other Western states which prevented the adoption of the summary document of the meeting, which had been convened within the framework of the all-European process. They occupied such a position to avoid acknowledgment of the instances of flagrant and mass human rights violations in the capitalist world--from the deprivation of the right to work of tens of millions of people through racial discrimination, to which whole peoples are subjected.

The European and world public commemorated extensively the 10th anniversary of the Helsinki forum, evaluating its historic significance at its proper worth. The Final Act and other documents of the all All-European Conference are not only realities telling of the past, Finnish President M. Koivisto said, welcoming the participants in the anniversary meeting in the Finlandia Palace, they are a live action program for today and a promise for the future. However, the process begun by the All-European Conference cannot advance only by force of inertia, progress depends primarily on the political will of its participants.

The Soviet Union has such will. It is profoundly devoted to the process of peaceful cooperation born of the All-European Conference. "It is our belief," E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, declared in his speech at the anniversary meeting, "that the detente of the 1970's was not a chance episode which has sunk into oblivion. It is valuable experience strengthening faith in the fact that the natural state of interstate relations corresponding to common interests is constructive dialogue and mutual cooperation." The numerous contacts in Helsinki between the representatives of the countries which took part in the anniversary meeting were a graphic demonstration of this.

4. The Economy and Policy in the Capitalist World

For a long time the capitalist countries have been experiencing a profound crisis affecting all spheres of society: social, political, economic, cultural and moral. Mass unemployment, the intensification of social inequality and the deterioration in ordinary people's living conditions, the winding down of production, currency disorders, the offensive against the working people's social and democratic gains, the deterioration in environmental conditions--this is how the situation in the capitalist world is evaluated in a joint statement of the CPSU and the French Communist Party in Moscow at the start of September.

The middle of the year is the time for summing up preliminary results. For the capitalist economy this summer they were disquieting. The unemployment level not only has not declined but has risen even compared with the corresponding period of last year, and according to data of the OECD Secretariat, in the 24 countries which are included in this organization over 30 million persons have been deprived of the right to work. True, economic growth has become more "balanced"--the gap in the growth rate between the three main regions of developed capitalism has been reduced. However, the rapprochement has occurred not as a result of an acceleration of the economic development of West Europe, which is languishing in the rear, but thanks to a sharp slowing of the growth rate in the United States and Japan.

The decline in business activity in these countries reflects to a certain extent the delay in the course of an economic upturn when the basic stimuli which contributed to the economic boom in the first period of post-crisis recovery are exhausted. This summer West Europe had hardly reached the precrisis level, 5 years back, of industrial production. And although it is the customary belief that this frontier marks the transition to the next phase of the cycle--from recovery to upturn--the situation in the economy of the West European states least resembles any kind of upturn: slack growth rate, technical stagnation and growing unemployment. In addition, such major countries as France, Italy and Great Britain have not even reached this provisional frontier.

The socioeconomic problems and currency-finance disorders of the EEC are being intensified by political contradictions, which are proving just as difficult to solve. Indicative in this plane was the European Council session held at the end of June in Milan at Common Market member head of state and government level.

Long before the convening of the session the West European press had been predicting that the main place therein would be occupied by problems of an acceleration of economic integration, reform of EEC institutions, cooperation in the sphere of progressive technology (the French Eureka project), currency-finance contradictions and a number of other questions. However, on the eve of the Milan meeting France and the FRG surprisingly announced their intention to submit for the session's discussion a draft "treaty on European union". This imparted an entirely different direction to the Milan meeting.

What is the essence of the draft? It provides for the extension of integration to foreign, military and scientific-technical policy. Practical realization of the draft "treaty on European union" would signify a broadening of the powers of the EC and the European Parliament and also--and this is the main purpose of the draft--a limitation of the members' national sovereignty and a strengthening of the "supranational" functions of Common Market bodies, particularly in the sphere of international policy. It is to this that the attempts of the "Eurocrats," as the top functionaries of the EEC are called, to have the unanimity principle at the time of decision-making canceled are geared. The initiators of the creation of a European union would thereby hold the levers with which the members with greater "weight" in the Common Market could dictate their will to the remaining participants.

Although a surprise for the other members of the Ten, the Franco-West German initiative did not contain anything new in principle. The idea of the creation of a European union has a long history. Back at the summit of leaders of the Community countries in 1974 in Paris then Belgian Prime Minister L. Tindemans was instructed to prepare a report on ways and means of transforming the European Communities (EEC, European Coal and Steel Community and Euratom) into a European union. Such a report was prepared at the end of 1975, but its lengthy study and discussion by the participants in the Community did not lead to any specific results: the demands of some members concerning profound transformations of the Common Market structures encountered the manifest opposition of others.

At the Stuttgart session of the European Council in 1983 the leaders of "little Europe" again returned to the idea of reform of the institutions of the Common Market, adopting the "Solemn Declaration on European Union," while the so-called "Arc Committee" for study of this question was set up in Fontainebleu in 1984.

For its part, back in 1981 the European Parliament had set up a special legislative commission which took several years to elaborate a draft "treaty on European union". After lengthy discussion, it was adopted on 14 February 1984.

The basis of the draft were the proposals which had been put forward by the Crocodile Club (formed in 1980 by A. Spinelli, prominent Italian politician, member of parliament and former member of the EC, and his sympathizers). The essence of the Spinelli recommendations consisted of imparting to the European Parliament on the eve of the latest elections thereto (June 1984) the nature of a real assembly and submitting to public opinion and the national parliaments a new European "constitution" suffused with federalist ideas.

However, the approval of the draft by the European parliament was a consequence of numerous compromises to which it was necessary to resort during its compilation. The authors of the document were forced to combine the most far-reaching propositions of Spinelli and other supporters of a "supranational" Europe with the objections of the opponents of an infringement of the rights and national sovereignty of the members. As a result the outlined plan for reform of the Common Market, while providing for a broadening of the powers of its institutions, at the same time reserved for the governments of the members the basic prerogatives in the solution of the most important problems, primarily in the political sphere.

In presenting a joint initiative literally on the eve of the Milan session Paris and Bonn, the West European press believes, were hoping to confront the partners with a fait accompli and not give them time not only to make amendments to the draft but even to study it. However, the attempt to catch the remaining participants in the meeting unawares and take the political barrier at a rush was unsuccessful. The proposal of France and the FRG encountered opposition on the part of Britain, Greece and Denmark, albeit for different reasons. London did not conceal its annoyance at this way of "discussing" Community problems, when it was not even considered necessary to consult with the partners ahead of time. Yet long prior to the convening of the Milan session the British press had been reporting that Whitehall was preparing its own plan for the "politicization" of the EEC. As far as Denmark, Greece and the other small Common Market members are concerned, they adopt an extremely guarded approach there to any attempts to strengthen the "supranational" functions of EEC bodies, rightly regarding them as being contrary to the national interests of these states.

Thus the political "conspiracy," as the Franco-West German action was evaluated in Common Market circles, ended in failure. "The EEC is picking up the pieces," the British FINANCIAL TIMES described the situation that had been created following the Milan session. Its participants were able to agree only

to once again discuss the question of ways of developing political integration at the intergovernmental conference in Luxembourg.

The sole asset of the Milan meeting was, perhaps, its participants' approval of the Eureka project, which provides for the West European countries' cooperation in the sphere of advanced technology. The idea of the creation of a "technological Europe," that is, unification of the West Europeans' scientific potential and resources in order to prevent a technology lag behind the United States and Japan and a brain drain across the Atlantic, which had been put forward by Paris in April and which originally did not win the partners' support, thereby began to blaze a trail for itself. It was decided to continue discussion of various aspects of realization of the project at a special conference of ministers of foreign affairs and scientific research.

Such a conference was held in Paris in mid-July. Representatives of 17 West European states (the 10 Common Market countries and also Spain, Portugal, Norway, Sweden, Austria, Switzerland and Finland) and EC representatives took part. The conference confirmed the need for creation of a "European technology community" and determined the basic directions of scientific research (supercomputers, microelectronics, artificial intelligence, lasers, biotechnology, optics and so forth). However, its participants were unable to agree on the organizational structure of the European agency for coordinating scientific research ("Eureka" for short. Whence the name of the entire project) and methods of mobilizing the necessary resources. Only the principle of mixed--private and public--financing of the program incorporated in Eureka was determined. Paris has already announced the allocation of Fr1 billion for realization of the project, however, other countries are not rushing to allocate resources as yet.

It also remains unclear who will undertake the coordination of the scientific research. The French proposals concerning organization of the project per a type of international consortium presuppose that the main role therein will be performed not by government bodies but big private companies possessing the necessary capital and scientific base.

Despite the assurances of the initiators of Eureka concerning the "purely civilian nature" of the project, the Paris conference failed to dispel the suspicions concerning the possibility of the use of the results of research for military purposes. In particular, one program within the project's framework provides for the creation of a space station, rocket and Shuttle type craft. Observers are calling attention in this connection to the statements of the representatives of a number of countries that Eureka is not aimed against the SDI and that individual companies of West European states may participate in realization of the American program. This applies primarily to the FRG, whose government is increasingly disposed toward such participation by West German companies.

For its part, Washington is continuing the pressure on the West Europeans, demanding that they define their attitude toward the "star wars" program as quickly as possible. This was the purpose pursued, inter alia, by the tour of a number of West European countries by Lt Gen J. Abrahamson, leader of the US organization, who sought the partners' consent to participate in the plans for the militarization of space.

Another target of pressure on the part of the United States is Japan. Washington does not conceal the fact that it would like to take advantage of this country's big achievements in the sphere of the latest technology for military purposes. The same Abrahamson cited in a television interview the spheres in which the United States aspires to "cooperation" with Japan: computer equipment with hardware and software, electronic-optical equipment and also the corresponding technology and laser equipment. Within the framework of the agreement on cooperation in the sphere of military technology concluded in November 1983 the Pentagon has already requested the transfer to it of the latest military technological developments. In spite of Tokyo's official statements, interaction between the two countries in realization of the "star wars" program is thereby beginning to acquire specific outlines.

And it is not confined to plans for the militarization of space. Washington was visited in June by K. Kato, chief of Japan's National Defense Agency, who held talks there with the U.S. defense secretary. In the course of the consultations C. Weinberger put the question thus: Japan should in the 1980's even carry out military commitments concerning "protection" of sea routes in a radius of up to 1,000 miles from Japan's shores.

The Japanese public, and not only it, regards the expansion of Japanese-American military cooperation as a direct path toward transformation of the "Security Treaty" between the two countries into an aggressive military alliance and Japan's conversion into a coparticipant in American adventures.

Stormy debate developed in Japan this past summer in connection with the government's intention to abandon under Washington's pressure the practice of holding the country's military spending within 1 percent of GNP, although even now its military budget occupies eighth place in the world. Such an intention was communicated by Prime Minister Y. Nakasone in connection with the compilation of the latest 5-year program for Japan's armed forces for 1986-1990. Bellicose circles of Washington and Tokyo are undermining the 1-percent barrier for the sake of Japan's "Self-Defense Force" assuming in the coming 5-year period functions of the U.S. 7th Fleet in the Northwest Pacific.

5. The Peoples Reject Imperialist Diktat

In the recent period the attention of the world community has been fixed on the events occurring in a number of parts of Asia, Africa and Latin America which have been assigned the name of "flash points" of the planet. Among them, perhaps the most explosive situation has taken shape in Southern Africa, where the flame of the liberation struggle against the racist regime has flared up. The crisis in the preserve of racism has been maturing for a long time, but the summer months were marked by particularly powerful demonstrations against apartheid.

Intimidated by their scale, the Pretoria regime cast aside the "constitutional reforms" game and on 21 July announced the imposition in a number of provinces of South Africa of a state of emergency. In the course of the mass repression which followed this hundred of people were killed and thousands imprisoned.

However, the terror of the authorities has proved incapable of stopping the wave of protest. On the contrary, it has brought about a growth of the mass movement for the liquidation of the shameful system of apartheid. Naturally, it is the "black" suburbs of the "white" cities of South Africa which have been caught up in the demonstrations to the greatest extent: after all, Africans, who constitute the majority of the population, are deprived of practically all rights, including the rights of citizenship in their own homeland. The government, as is known, is setting course toward implementation of the policy of eviction of the indigenous inhabitants to parts of the country which are not suitable for habitation and the creation there of so-called bantustans, which are granted pseudo-independence; the Africans automatically become "citizens" of these bantustans and not of South Africa.

Together with the Africans the "Coloreds" and also those who originally came from India, whom the authorities attempted with the aid of "constitutional reforms" to counterpose to the indigenous population, are also actively joining the struggle. The once unshakable "white monolith"--the basis of the apartheid regime--is crumbling. Recognition of the doomed nature of the existing orders in the country is growing increasingly among South Africa's white inhabitants.

The need for changes in Southern Africa is also beginning to be understood in Washington, where the racist regime has many reliable "friends" and patrons at the highest level. It is a question not, it is true, of the White House but of Capitol Hill. In connection with the imposition of the state of emergency the U.S. Congress advocated the application of sanctions, albeit quite limited, against Pretoria. The congressmen thereby made it understood to the White House: the situation in Southern Africa is such that it has to be reckoned with.

However, the legislators' action made no changes to the position of the administration, which is clinging stubbornly to a policy of "constructive engagement," which the White House continues to call an effective means of an "improvement" in the situation in South Africa.

An ambiguous position is occupied by Washington's allies also, West European primarily. Although all members of the EEC have paid lip-service to condemnation of the racist regime's oppression and even undertaken a demonstrative diplomatic demarche, recalling their ambassadors from Pretoria, the majority of them are in no hurry to impose sanctions against South Africa, in accordance with the draft resolution proposed by France in the UN Security Council (it calls merely for voluntary restrictive measures like a halt to new capital investments in the South African economy). While not daring to oppose this draft, Washington and London abstained during the vote, giving as the reason for their position the fact that, they say, it is not so much the racists as the black population which suffers from such measures.

But it is not, of course, a question of some "concern" on the part of the racist regime's foreign patrons there for the interests of the country's indigenous inhabitants. Uranium and diamonds, gold and coal, not to mention South Africa's exceptionally important strategic location--these are the real motives prompting the "champions of human rights" in the Western capitals to look through their fingers at the racists' bloody crimes.

Such a position was evaluated at its worth by Pretoria. Having assured himself of his own impunity, South African President P. Botha delivered a program speech in August in Durban in which he unequivocally declared that no relaxation of the racist regime was contemplated and that the country's government would continue to practice apartheid inasmuch as there was "no alternative" to it.

However, Washington swallowed this "bitter pill" also. Presidential National Security Adviser R. MacFarlane emphasized following Botha's speech that the head of the White House would remain true to "constructive engagement" with South Africa. Essentially the same position on this question was occupied by London and Bonn.

The West's manifest connivance is also manifested in its attitude toward the racist regime's operations on Namibian territory, which is occupied by South African forces. Endeavoring to retain at any price its hold on this pearl of the continent, which is being used as an object of the rapacious plunder of the South African and Western monopolies and also as a springboard for military-political pressure on neighboring countries, Pretoria organized the latest farce in the Namibian capital of Windhoek. The inauguration ceremony was held there in June of the puppet "provisional government," which the South African authorities are attempting to counterpose to SWAPO, which is recognized by the United Nations and other international organizations as the sole legitimate representative of the Namibian people. However, this venture by the racist regime failed: even Washington and London did not dare to openly support the farce, preferring to abstain during the voting in the UN Security Council on a resolution condemning South Africa for the continued occupation of Namibia and confirming the legitimacy of the Namibian people's struggle for freedom and independence.

The People's Republic of Mozambique commemorated on 25 June the 10th anniversary of the proclamation of independence under difficult conditions of confrontation with internal and external enemies. The country's leadership is having to tackle complex problems en route to overcoming the grim legacy of the colonial past and in the building of a new life. However, Pretoria did not succeed with the aid of the Nkomati Treaty in forcing the Mozambican leadership to consent to compromise with the counterrevolution and abandon the socialist orientation.

The days of June were anniversary days for a further African state following the course of a socialist orientation--the Democratic Republic of Madagascar: the 25th anniversary of the proclamation of independence and the 10th anniversary of the coming to power in the country of national-democratic forces headed by the present president, D. Ratsiraka. In tackling complex problems of socioeconomic development the republic is participating actively in the struggle against neocolonialism and for peace and social progress.

Recent months have been difficult for Ethiopia, which is overcoming the consequences of an unprecedented drought. However, despite the pessimistic predictions which were heard in the West, the Ethiopian revolution has passed the test of strength. Neither economic difficulties nor the operations of separatists have shaken the confidence of the country's leadership and its people in the soundness of the chosen path of the building of the new society.

The holding in the Ethiopian capital of the latest, 21st, session of the assembly of heads of state and government of the OAU testifies, in particular, to Ethiopia's growing authority on the African continent.

The session agenda contained key problems of the African continent: the struggle against drought, an increase in agricultural and industrial production, liquidation of the tremendous debt to the West and the development of extensive international economic cooperation. The session went beyond the framework of purely economic issues. Its participants paid great attention to political problems, primarily the situation in Southern Africa, which is fraught with serious consequences for security on the continent. The participants in the session also expressed concern in connection with the West's buildup of the arms race and endeavor to transfer it to space.

It is symbolic that the same questions were being discussed almost simultaneously in the Kenyan capital of Nairobi, a world conference for reviewing and evaluating the achievements of the UN Women's Decade was being held: equality, development and peace. The results of the conference testify that the delegations of Western states, primarily the United States, were unable to prevent discussion of political problems. The vast majority of the participants from more than 150 countries sharply criticized Washington's policy of spurring international tension and increasing the arms race.

The first all-African conference in the history of the continent on security, disarmament and development, which was conducted at ministerial level under the aegis of the United Nations and the OAU in August in the Togo capital of Lome, was also devoted to problems of war and peace. In the course of the discussion the representatives of African states expressed concern at the process of the stockpiling of modern arms, nuclear included, in the world, emphasized the danger of Pretoria's nuclear aspirations, which are being realized with the assistance of the Western powers, and supported the creation of a nuclear-free zone in Africa. Our peoples, Acting OAU General Secretary P. Onu declared, addressing the conference in Lome, are taking the path of disarmament, and we are opposed to the deployment of foreign military bases and nuclear weapons on the continent.

Such a position manifestly runs counter to the plans of the Pentagon, which aspires to the conversion of the African continent into a military-strategic springboard. Use of the territory of a number of African states for the United States "Rapid Deployment Force," in particular, testifies to this. At the start of August subunits of these forces in conjunction with the U.S. Air Force and Navy conducted on the territory of Egypt and also Jordan, Somalia and Oman maneuvers codenamed "Bright Star-85". Besides the American armed forces, the national armies of the above-mentioned states took part in the maneuvers. The public of African and Arab countries evaluated the holding of the maneuvers as a direct threat to the security of the peoples of the region.

Yet the Pentagon's show of "military muscle" and the escalation of threats in this part of the world have now become the norm. Thus in June, taking advantage of the incident involving Lebanese Shi'ite Muslims' seizure of the American Boeing 727 aircraft, Washington mounted a hysterical anti-Lebanese campaign. An armada of warships including the aircraft carrier "Nimitz" with

1,800 marines was dispatched to the East Mediterranean. American reconnaissance aircraft appeared in Lebanese skies constantly. Although the incident involving the seizure of the American aircraft has been settled, Washington is nonetheless continuing to spur military hysteria in respect of this country, which is exacerbating extraordinarily the already explosive situation in Lebanon.

After 2 months of relative quiet, the bloody clashes in Beirut resumed once again in mid-August, and a "dynamite war," which paralyzed the life of the capital, flared up. Although it was possible with Syrian mediation to reach an agreement on a cease-fire, the situation remains tense.

Under the conditions of the new outburst of tension in Lebanon and the Near East as a whole a special conference of heads of state and government of Arab countries was held in the Moroccan city of Casablanca in the first half of August on the initiative of Morocco's King Hassan II. This was a most unrepresentative top-level meeting. Syria, the PDRY, Algeria, Libya and Lebanon boycotted it. Nor were the leaders of certain other Arab countries, including Saudi Arabia, present at the conference.

The reasons for so manifest a lack of unity among the leaders of Arab states were connected with the conference agenda--discussion of the agreement "on a framework of joint actions" signed in Amman this February by Jordan's King Hussein and Y. Arafat. This agreement is seen by Arab patriotic forces as an attempt to impose on the Arabs the notorious "Reagan Plan". In the opinion of opponents of the conference, its convening in the current situation was manifestly inappropriate and was to the benefit of circles which, under the thumb of Washington and Israel, are undermining an all-Arab position in respect of securing the legitimate rights of the Arab people of Palestine and, essentially, taking the path of separate deals.

It was not fortuitous that immediately following completion of the Casablanca conference Washington resumed its "shuttle diplomacy": Assistant U.S. Secretary of State R. Murphy made a trip to Jordan, Israel and Egypt to prepare for direct Jordanian-Israeli negotiations. Progressive forces in the Near East rightly saw this as an endeavor by the United States to reanimate the Camp David agreements rejected by the Arabs.

The continuing Iran-Iraq conflict is doing considerable damage to the unity and cohesion of the Arab states. It is also resulting in tremendous sacrifices and devastation for the peoples of the belligerents themselves. The summer months did not bring this pointless conflict any nearer to a conclusion. Military operations are continuing, despite the efforts being made by the international community for the purpose of achieving a peaceful settlement.

The situation surrounding the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan [DRA] in connection with the undeclared war against it which has been unleashed by the United States in alliance with local reaction and a number of neighboring states, also remains tense. Thus bandit raids into Afghanistan from Pakistani territory were incessant all summer. The rebels carried out raids on villages, organized sabotage and set up roadside ambushes. All this subversive activity is being generously financed by Washington and its allies. The present year alone the Afghan counterrevolutionaries will have received \$280 million from the United States.

In this difficult situation the Afghan people are continuing under the leadership of the PDPA to advance along the path of building a new life. An important landmark at this stage were the first free democratic elections to the local jirgas (councils of people's representatives) in the country's history. They are being held in stages, with regard for the situation in different provinces. The successful results of the elections in the capital and Kabul Province are an indication that Afghanistan's working people are fully resolved to uphold the gains of the revolution, rebuff counterrevolutionary forces and implement progressive transformations even more actively.

In the preservation of tension around Afghanistan and in the region as a whole a particular role is being assigned by imperialism and local reaction to Pakistan, which long since became the main springboard of the undeclared war against the DRA and subversive activity in respect of India. To judge by the events of recent months, Pakistan's military regime by no means intends abandoning the policy of the country's militarization and even closer military-political cooperation with Washington. The recent transatlantic visit by Pakistani Foreign Minister S. Yaqub Khan testifies to this. The main subject at the negotiations in Washington was the question of the conclusion of a new agreement between Washington and Islamabad providing for the granting to Pakistan as of 1987 of \$6 billion in addition to the \$3.2 billion of assistance rendered it already.

Islamabad's policy is naturally giving rise to concern in neighboring India, where Pakistan's militarization is seen as a threat to peace and security in South and Southwest Asia. The Indian leadership emphatically supports a normalization of the situation in the region and good-neighborly relations with all adjacent countries. It advocates just as consistently the peaceful solution of the long-standing conflicts in the Punjab, Assam and other states.

The efforts made in this direction led to the conclusion of agreements on a settlement of the political crisis in the state of Punjab. The document was signed by Prime Minister R. Gandhi and H.S. Longowal, chairman of the Akali Dal Party. The country, the Indian press observed, breathed a sigh of relief. However, reaction intended impeding the process of political normalization. On 20 August Sikh terrorists murdered Longowal. The situation in Punjab was aggravated yet again. Nonetheless, the Indian Government declared that acts of terror would not force it to change its policy of strengthening unity in the country and preserving its territorial integrity.

In the struggle for an improvement in the international climate on the Asian continent an increasingly big role is being performed by the three Indochina countries: Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. A special place in this struggle belongs to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, which recently celebrated the 40th anniversary of the August popular-democratic revolution, which was a critical stage in the country's history.

The Vietnamese people have trodden a difficult path in this time. Wars and intervention, economic devastation and many other problems have had to be overcome on this path. But, relying on the assistance and support of the socialist community states, primarily the USSR, and the fraternal alliance of the Indochina countries, it has scored impressive successes in building a socialist society.

In this difficult situation the Afghan people are continuing under the leadership of the PDPA to advance along the path of building a new life. An important landmark at this stage were the first free democratic elections to the local jirgas (councils of people's representatives) in the country's history. They are being held in stages, with regard for the situation in different provinces. The successful results of the elections in the capital and Kabul Province are an indication that Afghanistan's working people are fully resolved to uphold the gains of the revolution, rebuff counterrevolutionary forces and implement progressive transformations even more actively.

In the preservation of tension around Afghanistan and in the region as a whole a particular role is being assigned by imperialism and local reaction to Pakistan, which long since became the main springboard of the undeclared war against the DRA and subversive activity in respect of India. To judge by the events of recent months, Pakistan's military regime by no means intends abandoning the policy of the country's militarization and even closer military-political cooperation with Washington. The recent transatlantic visit by Pakistani Foreign Minister S. Yaqub Khan testifies to this. The main subject at the negotiations in Washington was the question of the conclusion of a new agreement between Washington and Islamabad providing for the granting to Pakistan as of 1987 of \$6 billion in addition to the \$3.2 billion of assistance rendered it already.

Islamabad's policy is naturally giving rise to concern in neighboring India, where Pakistan's militarization is seen as a threat to peace and security in South and Southwest Asia. The Indian leadership emphatically supports a normalization of the situation in the region and good-neighborly relations with all adjacent countries. It advocates just as consistently the peaceful solution of the long-standing conflicts in the Punjab, Assam and other states.

The efforts made in this direction led to the conclusion of agreements on a settlement of the political crisis in the state of Punjab. The document was signed by Prime Minister R. Gandhi and H.S. Longowal, chairman of the Akali Dal Party. The country, the Indian press observed, breathed a sigh of relief. However, reaction intended impeding the process of political normalization. On 20 August Sikh terrorists murdered Longowal. The situation in Punjab was aggravated yet again. Nonetheless, the Indian Government declared that acts of terror would not force it to change its policy of strengthening unity in the country and preserving its territorial integrity.

In the struggle for an improvement in the international climate on the Asian continent an increasingly big role is being performed by the three Indochina countries: Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. A special place in this struggle belongs to the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, which recently celebrated the 40th anniversary of the August popular-democratic revolution, which was a critical stage in the country's history.

The Vietnamese people have trodden a difficult path in this time. Wars and intervention, economic devastation and many other problems have had to be overcome on this path. But, relying on the assistance and support of the socialist community states, primarily the USSR, and the fraternal alliance of the Indochina countries, it has scored impressive successes in building a socialist society.

A conference of foreign ministers of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam was held in August in Phnom Penh which put forward new proposals for ensuring peace and security in Southeast Asia. Thus for the purpose of a normalization of all-around progress made by Cambodia in the past 6 years, Cambodia and Vietnam decided to continue the gradual withdrawal of units of Vietnamese volunteers from this country in order for it to be finally completed by 1990. The new proposals of the three Indochina countries, Vietnamese Foreign Minister Nguyen Co Thach declared, correspond to the vitally important interests of all countries of the region and could initiate a process of negotiations and contribute to an easing of tension and the creation of an atmosphere conducive to a peaceful, constructive solution of the problems of Southeast Asia and Cambodia.

The visit of Nguyen Co Thach to Jakarta and his negotiations with Indonesian Foreign Minister M. Kusumaatmadja also undoubtedly contributed to an improvement in the climate in the region. The results of the meetings held in the latter half of August testify that certain ASEAN countries are beginning to recognize the irreversibility of the process of the strengthening of people's power in Cambodia and also that the complex problems which exist can be solved at the negotiating table.

The problems of Asian security as a whole are still on the agenda of international meetings and conferences. Thus the enlarged session of the Presidential Committee of the Organization of Solidarity of the Peoples of Asia and Africa held in Ho Chi Minh City attracted the great attention of the international community. The session discussed topical problems of Afro-Asian solidarity, the situation in different parts of Asia and the tasks confronting the public for strengthening national independence, peace and security.

It should be noted that representatives of the public of Australia and New Zealand took part in the committee session for the first time. While not Asian states, they nonetheless display great interest in the strengthening of security in the vast Pacific region. The decisions of the 16th session of the South Pacific Forum held in Avarua--the administrative center of the Cook Islands--testify to this. The 13 states which participated, including Australia and New Zealand, supported declaration of the South Pacific a nuclear-free zone.

A document adopted at the session solemnly proclaimed renunciation of the development, use and testing of any nuclear explosive devices. Furthermore, the countries of the forum officially banned the acquisition and importation onto their territory of nuclear weapons and also the discharge and dumping of radioactive waste in this region.

Naturally, the decisions of the forum in Avarua gave rise to the discontent of the United States and a number of its NATO allies. After all, they run manifestly counter to the Pentagon's militarist plans in respect of the Asia-Pacific region, which is being assigned an increasingly important role in U.S. global strategy.

Washington is endeavoring to keep within its sights countries whose peoples are struggling against imperialist diktat and for the sovereign right to decide their fate independently. At the forward boundary of this struggle are today the people of Nicaragua, who in July commemorated the sixth anniversary of the revolution. It was celebrated under the conditions of the incessant hostile actions on the part of the U.S. Administration. An American squadron which included the nuclear-powered aircraft carrier "Eisenhower" was dispatched to the shores of Central America in August. Provocations on the Nicaraguan Costa Rican border are continuing. American mercenaries are carrying out attacks on Nicaraguan border posts.

Representatives of the Washington administration do not conceal their aims: a mood is strengthening in the American capital, the NEW YORK TIMES reports, in support of "removal of the Sandinista leadership". Under White House pressure American legislators lifted the restrictions on financial support for the "Contras," having approved a bill providing for the allocation to them of \$27 million in the form of so-called "humanitarian assistance". Simultaneously the United States is continuing the indoctrination of Nicaragua's neighbors, attempting to involve them even more deeply in the conflict with Managua and push them toward direct aggression against the republic.

However, the Nicaraguans are not to be intimidated. They are fully resolved to defend the freedom and independence of their motherland weapon in hand. "The Nicaraguan people will not go down on their knees in the face of the menacing buildup of U.S. warships around our country," Nicaraguan President D. Ortega said. In the event of direct U.S. aggression, he emphasized, the Nicaraguan people will defend their independence.

Obviously, under the conditions of Washington's blackmail the activity of the Contadora Group (it includes Mexico, Colombia, Venezuela and Panama) is encountering big difficulties. Its efforts for the achievement of a political settlement in Central America are invariably frustrated by the United States. However, an understanding of the fact that the problem can and must be solved only by way of negotiation is growing in the region. The inclusion in the process of the search for peace on the continent of the new "Latin American Contadora Support Group," which incorporates Argentina, Brazil, Peru and Uruguay, testifies to this.

While not sparing dollars intended for the murder of totally innocent women, old men and children and terror and sabotage against a sovereign country Washington displays amazing stinginess when it is a question of Latin American states' search for a way out of the labyrinth of multibillion-dollar indebtedness. This, in particular, was dealt with in the Palace of Congress of the Cuban capital, where a "continental dialogue"--a meeting of representatives of 33 Latin American countries who discussed problems connected with the \$360 billion-plus debt of the state of the region--was held.

The majority of participants in the meeting advocated a refusal to pay off the constraining foreign debt. Today, F. Castro, first secretary of the Cuban Communist Party Central Committee and chairman of the republic State

Council and Council of Ministers, declared, addressing the meeting, it is clear to everyone that no country--with few very exceptions--has a practical possibility of paying off the debt. If one person, he noted, set about recounting Latin America's foreign debt at a speed of \$1 per second, this would take 11,574 years. And if the interest on the debt were counted at the same speed--12,860 years.

The main reasons which led to such a substantial growth of the foreign debt are rooted in the unequal economic relations with the capitalist states and the policy of the West's monopoly capita, which is pulling the debt noose increasingly tightly around the Latin American states for the purpose of extracting increasingly new profit from them. The loans granted to these countries now in practice go not toward the development of their economy but merely to pay off the debt.

For this reason many of those who spoke at the meeting in Havana advocated that a way out of the debt crisis bondage be sought on the path of the establishment of a new international economic order. After all, if there is no change in the existing state of affairs, the debt noose will literally "strangle" the weak economies of the developing states, bringing new sufferings to hundreds of millions of inhabitants of Asian, African and Latin American countries.

Mankind is experiencing an alarming, critical time: the arms race is increasing, and the military threat is not abating.

The continuing deterioration in Soviet-American relations and the campaign being mounted across the Atlantic of hostility and hatred toward our country cannot fail to give rise to concern also.

M.S. Gorbachev pointed to the impermissibility, danger and senselessness of such an approach by the United States to relations with the Soviet Union in replies to the American TIME Magazine. He emphasized that all attempts to bring the Soviet Union to its knees and wear it out are doomed to fail.

The language of force, even more, the "from a position of strength" policy in the nuclear and space age entails the threat of the annihilation of everything living on Earth. The Soviet leadership is fully aware of its responsibility for the fate of peace and calls on Washington to display the same sense of responsibility in the present explosive situation.

"All people want to live, nobody wants to die," the CPSU Central Committee general secretary declared. "For this reason it is necessary to summon up the political courage and halt the unfolding menacing process. It is necessary to halt the arms race and embark on disarmament and an improvement in relations."

Such is our country's clear and honest approach, to the forthcoming November meeting of the Soviet and American leaders in Geneva included. The danger looming over the peoples may be averted--it is to this that the USSR's specific proposals are geared, be it a question of the nonmilitarization of space, the banning of all nuclear tests, the limitation and reduction of nuclear arms, both strategic and intermediate-range, or a political settlement of conflict situations in "flash points".

This position is humanitarian and nonegoistic and corresponds fully to the interests of both the USSR and the United States and all other peoples.

It is significant that the Soviet foreign policy initiatives are enjoying the most widespread positive comments in the international community. Prominent politicians and public figures and a multitude of various organizations all over the world, in the United States included, warmly supported the Soviet Union's decision to declare a moratorium on nuclear explosions. This decision was greeted enthusiastically by the participants in the 12th World Festival of Youth and Students in Moscow.

The delegates to the UN General Assembly anniversary 40th Session in New York evaluate highly the new USSR proposal concerning the basic directions and principles of international cooperation in the peaceful conquest of space under the conditions of its nonmilitarization.

These and many other specific steps of the Soviet Union aimed at an improvement in the international situation are profoundly consonant with the demands of the world antiwar, antinuclear movement--the world's broadest public movement. The events of recent months have confirmed once again the soundness of the Soviet viewpoint that a difference in world view or political differences should not serve as an impediment to joint action for the purpose of solving the main global problem--preventing a general nuclear catastrophe.

The broad international support of our country's efforts to preserve peace on Earth instills optimism and faith in the victory of common sense and good will. In the name of this goal the Soviet people will continue to spare no forces, striving for a further upsurge of the socialist economy and putting forward increasingly new peace initiatives. And our reserves of constructiveness are vast.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/2

UN SPONSORS ASIAN SECURITY CONFERENCE IN TASHKENT

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 134-137

[A. Bogomolov report: "International Seminar in Tashkent"]

[Text] The international seminar "Peace and Security in the Asia-Pacific Region," which was organized under the aegis of the UN University (Tokyo) in conjunction with the USSR Academy of Sciences, was held in Tashkent from 27 through 29 April.

The holding of this scientific forum in the year of the celebration by all progressive mankind of the 40th anniversary of the Great Victory over German fascism and Japanese militarism is profoundly symbolic. The experience of WWII proved convincingly that states with different socioeconomic systems are capable of uniting their efforts in the face of a common enemy. Today, it was said in the greetings addressed to the seminar participants by Academician P.N. Fedoseyev, vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences, all peoples have a single mortal enemy--the threat of world nuclear catastrophe. And therefore the task of ensuring security in Asia, as, equally, in any other part of the world, inevitably goes beyond the regional framework. The complication of the international situation in Asia and the Pacific explains the aspiration to the creation of a special mechanism here of discussion of security problems, in whose formation a positive part could be played by the scholars of the states located in this region. P.N. Fedoseyev called on the participants in the meeting to concentrate efforts on ascertainment of the positive and constructive features which scholars could offer to the attention of the world community and which could contribute to the cause of a strengthening of mutual understanding and peace on our planet.

A general analysis of the causes of the complication of the situation in Asia and practicable ways of stabilizing it was made in the report of Academician Ye.M. Primakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies. He also emphasized that Asian problems cannot be examined outside of global aspects. The current international situation, which is characterized by a high degree of tension as a consequence of Washington's efforts to impose on the world a new, extraordinarily dangerous round of the arms race, is fraught with the danger of the unleashing of a nuclear war capable of wiping out human civilization. Preventing such a catastrophe is the common task of

all peoples on Earth, the Asian peoples included. The wide-ranging peace initiatives proposed by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries serve these goals. The activity of the USSR and its allies is aimed at stabilizing the situation at the global and regional levels, and for this reason they attach such great significance to the task of settling various conflicts in all parts of the world.

An obstacle in the way of realization of the peace proposals put forward by the socialist countries and aimed at reducing tension and stabilizing the situation in Asia and the world as a whole, Ye.M. Primakov noted, is the lack of a positive response to them on the part of the United States and NATO members. This is connected primarily with their sharply negative attitude toward the present balance of forces between the USSR and the United States and Warsaw Pact and NATO. The actions of the United States in West Europe in respect of the deployment there of first-strike nuclear missiles, however dangerous they are in themselves, are merely a component of Washington's global military planning. The expansion and strengthening of the combat potential of the American naval and air forces in the Indian and Pacific oceans and the strong points where they are based, from which a nuclear strike could be delivered over a considerable part of the territory of the Soviet Union, is every reason to believe that Washington is speeding up the creation of a Pacific theater stretching from Alaska to Australia and from the shores of Asia to California. By means of military bases in the Indian Ocean it is combined with the European theater. Attempts are thereby being made to create a global nuclear ring around the USSR and the other socialist countries.

Naturally, the situation in Asia cannot be characterized only from the viewpoint of the new trends and accents in the United States' strategic approach to confrontation with the Soviet Union. Other factors, among which the speaker highlighted particularly the policy of China and Japan, also interact here. However, whereas Chinese policy may be regarded as an entirely independent factor, in Japan's case the undoubted dependence of its foreign policy on the global and regional interests of the United States calls attention to itself.

The dynamics of the mutual relations between Asian states at the subregional level are determined by the action of two trends--centrifugal and centripetal. The first is manifested in the existence of subregional associations in Asia which are as yet mainly of an economic nature. The second is determined by the evolution of conflict situations, without the settlement of which questions of ensuring peace and security in this region cannot be solved.

A whole number of speeches emphasized the organic interconnection between the struggle for peace and disarmament and the accomplishment of the task of surmounting economic inequality. In particular, it was noted that world military spending is 20 times greater than the amount of official aid rendered the developing states by the OECD countries. But even such aid is geared not to overcoming economic backwardness but serves as a kind of substitute for or addition to the military "assistance" made available for "containing communism" (R. Khan, India).

G. Anthony (Fiji) observed that today the entire Indian Ocean is covered by a network of American military bases aimed not only against the USSR.

They threaten the stability and sovereignty of the states located here and their right to dispose of the natural resources which belong to them and afford Washington an opportunity to exercise "gunboat diplomacy" in respect of governments which are inconvenient to it.

The pernicious influence of imperialist policy on the international situation in Asia was noted by many participants in the seminar, although far from all of them were able to make a correct appraisal of the causes of the emergence of regional conflicts and determine ways of settling them.

In the course of such a representative forum as the seminar in Tashkent differences in the approach of its participants to the solution of the questions under discussion and a certain one-sidedness and, at times, bias of judgments even, which sometimes exacerbated the course of the discussion, could not have failed to have been displayed.

Thus it transpired that certain difficulties for the formulation of a uniform approach to a solution of the questions which had been raised may be engendered by a dissimilar interpretation of certain seemingly unequivocal concepts like, for example, the "threat" concept. And it is not only a question of the specific conditions of the national formation and political and socioeconomic development of this state or the other of the region here. Among Western scholars, (A. Magno) (Philippines) observed, there is a tendency to interpret the notion of "threat" and the "national security" of the emergent countries in accordance with their own ideas concerning security and ideological principles. As an illustration the Filipino scholar cited the developing states of Southeast Asia, for which geopolitical aspects are not of the significance they are for the United States and Japan inasmuch as, as distinct from the latter, problems of a domestic nature are the subject of their paramount attention.

What really is impeding the normalization of relations and the stabilization of the political situation in Southeast Asia? For an answer to this question it should be ascertained first of all who has an interest in the preservation of tension surrounding Cambodia. K. Thiravit (Thailand) did not conceal the fact not only of political but also military assistance to the Pol Pot people. His statement that Bangkok is satisfied with the situation that has evolved around Cambodia and finds it beneficial to ASEAN as a whole also inasmuch as this on the one hand "is undermining the prestige" of Vietnam and, on the other, attracting greater international attention than usual to this grouping had quite a cynical ring. Furthermore, K. Thiravit attempted to portray the Soviet Union as the country most interested in a continuation of the conflict in Indochina.

Such conclusions, as Doctor of Economic Sciences G.I. Chufrin (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies) pointed out, are contrary to both the facts and elementary common sense. The USSR is objectively interested in the preservation of peace and stability in this region and the normal development of relations between all the states located here and aspires to contribute to this in every possible way.

Certain other participants in the discussion expressed themselves in the same spirit. They also noted that international and regional stability is materially essential for the successful accomplishment of the tasks of an acceleration of the Asian states' socioeconomic development. This point was dwelt on in detail by (Yan Tszyazhun) (PRC). He advocated a further improvement in Soviet-Chinese relations and a halt to the arms race. However, he formulated this, as a whole positive, position against the background of the "equal responsibility of the two superpowers" concept. As Doctor of Historical Sciences N.A. Simoniya (USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Oriental Studies) observed, an approach to international problems in accordance with this principle is beneficial to Washington inasmuch as it conceals the true causes of the arms race and sources of tension in the world and, consequently, prevents the charting of specific measures to do away with them.

The analysis of the causes of the emergence and continuation of regional conflicts was made more often than not at the seminar from the standpoints of the role of external factors. Characteristic in this respect was the report of K.P. Mishra (India): on the basis of the example of Indian-Pakistani contradictions he attempted to demonstrate the degree of influence of external forces on the South Asian subcontinent. Having opted, as distinct from peace-loving and nonaligned India, for a path of military-political bloc-forming with the West, Pakistan is obtaining weapons from it in quantitative and qualitative respects which are in no way justified by its defense needs. History testifies, Mishra pointed out, that in the end these weapons have been used "against India and only against India."

This is, of course, true, but only partly so. It is sufficient to look at the unseemly role which Pakistan is performing in the undeclared war against the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which is being financed by the West. However, the question raised by the Indian scholar has a broader context. It serves as a reminder to states of the entire Asia-Pacific region that the policy of American imperialism and the allies armed by it is aimed not only against the USSR but also against all democratic, progressive, peace-loving forces in Asia. This also explains the numerous attacks on India's independent foreign policy course and its traditionally strong and friendly relations with the Soviet Union.

Much as been said in recent years about the shifting of the accent in Washington's global strategy toward Asia, which is manifested in the unprecedented growth of American military power here. In this plane B. Cummings (United States) suggested that the state of affairs on the Korean peninsula be viewed as a characteristic example of the fact that in our time no regional conflict can be an isolated phenomenon and, consequently, that it inevitably contains a potential threat of a global nature. This is confirmed by the development in the United States of scenarios of the escalation of regional conflicts as far as the use of nuclear weapons. After all, it is with such an outcome that the continued stockpiling of conventional and nuclear arms on the territory of South Korea is fraught inasmuch as the American command does not in practice require special authorization of the U.S. Congress to use the military power concentrated here.

(Khvan Gi On) (DPRK) pointed to the fact that South Korea, which is, according to U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger, of colossal strategic significance for the entire "free world," should be regarded as the most important American military base in the region representing a danger both to the DPRK and other states. This is indicated by the formation of the Washington--Tokyo--Seoul military-strategic axis.

The plans for demilitarization of the Asia-Pacific region put forward at the seminar were of considerable interest. Many speakers called the task of the creation of nuclear-free zones here an essential part of this strategy.

(R. Tenter) (Australia) believes that a nuclear-free zone, as an instrument of broader nuclear and, possibly, conventional disarmament, at the same time does not signify disarmament as such but merely a geographical redistribution of nuclear arms. Attention is usually focused solely on nuclear weapons, although the problem of the creation of nuclear-free zones also has other aspects, which were touched on in the course of the seminar, such as the recovery, shipment and burial of radioactive materials and also the extensively ramified military infrastructure servicing primarily American nuclear potential.

K. Clements (New Zealand) observed that the United States' hardline policy in respect of his country is aimed not only at shaking its position on the question of the calls of ships carrying nuclear weapons: the "sobering effect," according to the White House's intention, is to "work" on the scale of the entire Asia-Pacific region. This applies primarily to the participants in ASEAN, who declared back in 1971 their aspiration to convert their region into a "zone of peace, freedom and neutrality" and in 1984 advanced the idea of the creation in Southeast Asia of a nuclear-free zone. According to (R. Tenter), the prospects of realization of this initiative, at least for the immediate foreseeable future, are somewhat dubious inasmuch as it does not touch on the problem of the presence of American military bases on the Philippines and fits ill with the programs for an arms buildup by the ASEAN states themselves.

A number of speeches at the seminar cast serious doubt on the capacity of the developing countries--as a consequence of their intensifying political and economic differentiation--to act as a united front. There were also critical remarks about the nonaligned movement. (Lim Tek Gi) (Malaysia) characterized the evolution of this movement from the time of the 1955 Bandung Conference through the anniversary meeting this May as "development in line of descent". The categorical nature of such a conclusion gave rise to objections. In N.A. Simoniya's opinion, the coming into being of the nonaligned movement should be regarded in a historical perspective and certain stages therein should be distinguished. In three decades the movement has covered a significant path--from an approach to the problem of ensuring general peace and international security as a matter concerning virtually the "superpowers" exclusively, and for this reason viewed in isolation from tasks of economic and social development proper, to a considerably more realistic approach in determination of the priorities of its domestic and foreign policy aims.

The endeavor of the majority of participants to also determine a range of problems which remained beyond the framework of discussion and outline directions for the further study of problems of peace and security testified to the constructive nature, as a whole, of the seminar. A summarizing bibliographical account of the state of research into corresponding problems in various countries was prepared and disseminated in advance for this purpose on the initiative of the leadership of the UN University. The experience of the Tashkent seminar demonstrated, as many of its participants noted, the fruitfulness of the UN University's continued cooperation not only with the USSR Academy of Sciences but also the need for an expansion of the sphere of its relations beyond the framework of nongovernmental organizations and the enlistment of national research organizations in the study of such major comprehensive questions as the problem of the Indian Ocean, for example.

The absence of agreement among the participants in the seminar on a number of issues, including those of a fundamental nature, gave rise to (K. Musyakodzi's) (Japan) observations of a methodological plane. He called on the scholars to accentuate attention not to the argument concerning their associative perception of this concept or the other ("state," "peace," "security," "threat") but to penetrating the essence of phenomena. The need was emphasized in this connection for a more in-depth analysis of the cause-and-effect relations of the changes occurring in the world, which would make it possible to switch from a description of phenomena, of regional conflicts in particular, to generalizations enabling us to ascertain the roots of the emergence of crisis situations and the causes of the militarization of individual developing countries.

The closing remarks were delivered by P.N. Fedoseyev. Having noted the businesslike nature of the discussions (albeit sometimes of a sharp nature), he made an on the whole positive evaluation of the work of the seminar, stressing here the need for any serious scientist to make the cornerstone here considerations which contribute to a solution of the problems that have been raised. The ultimate goal should be elimination of the threat of war, and the main means of achieving it general disarmament. In advancing positive proposals it is necessary to first of all ask oneself the question: what is preventing their realization? The answer makes it clear who is really struggling for disarmament and who is erecting numerous barriers on this path.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850
CSO: 1816/2

BOOK ON WESTERN ANTI-SOVIET PROPAGANDA REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 138-139

[Yu. Oleshchuk review: "Against Ideological Sabotage"]

[Text] This book* is devoted to an exposure of the aims and methods of imperialist, anti-Soviet propaganda. Concisely, but interestingly the author familiarizes the reader with the genesis of the intensification of imperialism's ideological-sabotage activity against socialism characteristic of recent years. It shows that this intensification is of a purely "work" purpose and is by no means based on the declared aspiration to an "objective illustration of events"--the thoroughly fraudulent justification to which anti-Soviets frequently refer. In this connection the work quotes an eloquent opinion extracted from the minutes of the U.S. Congress: "...an arms buildup cannot be considered the sole method of strengthening the United States' positions in the world: the power of ideas is just as great as the power of weapons" (p 19).

The power of ideas corresponding to the vital interests of the peoples is truly great. Nor is there anywhere in the modern world where one can escape the struggle of ideas. But the whole point is that imperialist propaganda aspires to substitute for the struggle and honest competition of the two opposite ideologies "psychological warfare". V. Artemov shows on the basis of facts and figures on what kind of scale and how this war is waged and sets forth the singularities of contemporary imperialist, anti-Soviet propaganda, its most prevalent methods and the techniques of falsification and inventions enlisted for increasing effectiveness of impact. The book emphasizes the anti-Soviets' constant quest for new subjects for ideological sabotage. They are developed thoroughly, in good time, and all propaganda media of the bourgeois states are associated with them and they are worked out in unison and over a long period. "The 'human rights' campaign, say, appeared when the preceding campaign--'for freedom of exchange'--had proved an unsuccessful fiasco and which, in turn, had replaced other long-running, but also failed anti-Soviet campaigns" (pp 61-62).

* Vladimir Artemov, "Pravda o nepravde. Kriticheskiye ocherki po sovremennoy imperialisticheskoy antisovetskoy propagande" [Truth About Untruth. Critical Essays on Contemporary Imperialist Anti-Soviet Propaganda], Moscow, Izdatel'stvo politicheskoy literatury, 1984, p 270.

In openly interfering in the socialist states' internal affairs with the aid of anticomunist propaganda wars imperialism is attempting to shake their social system. Both the present and past of imperialist propaganda are eloquent testimony to this. The latest proof of this was the ideological intervention in Poland, which assumed such proportions and such a level that it may be characterized as the real export of counterrevolution. Analyzing imperialism's subversive activity against the socialist states, the author provides his classification of its main directions, which is of interest both to the general reader and to specialists (p 157).

The section on the "psychologization" of imperialist, anti-Soviet propaganda is perfectly justified. In fact, this propaganda is being conducted by increasingly subtle methods, enlisting in its aid science, particularly psychology. Specialists in anti-Sovietism have grasped full well that "direct propaganda," that is, open slander and the unconcealed lie, "works" inadequately. Nor are there any greater "returns" in instances when the anti-Soviet targeting of radio and television broadcasts, articles, books and so forth is too manifestly discernible. The reader and listener have little trust in such tendentious products, understanding that they have been prepared with a definite design. And it is then that "psychologized" propaganda--the dangerous, truly poisoned weapon of lies--is set in motion.

The essence thereof consists of information--more precisely, disinformation--being presented by such methods that the ordinary person often cannot discern the manifest tendentiousness and unconcealed endeavor to slander socialism and the Soviet Union. He is offered a number of facts and a description of a number of events of a seemingly impartial nature, but from which he himself inevitably has to draw an anti-Soviet conclusion. And the illusion is created in the ordinary person that he has arrived at such a conclusion independently, without any suggestions and prompting: the anti-Soviet view assumes for him an authentic nature, one that is his own and not imposed from outside. The book's exposition of other, even more resourceful methods of the "psychologization" of propaganda (pp 168-195) makes interesting reading. The reader will find here a description of the most diverse psychological tricks by means of which the professionals of anti-Sovietism try to ensure that their tendentious, malevolent product be unfailingly assimilated by those to whom it is addressed.

A particular theme in the work is the use of stereotypes (that is, evolved, stable ideas concerning a social object) and also exploitation of the very gravitation of the human consciousness toward the formation of stereotypes. Playing on these attributes of the human mentality, anti-Sovietism aspires to form stable false stereotypes concerning the socialist social system, the ethno-psychology of the Russian people, the motives of Soviet foreign policy and so forth. Anti-Soviets strive to ensure that socialism is "automatically" identified in people's consciousness with something negative and that the Soviet Union's policy in the international arena also be automatically connected with the proposition concerning the "Soviet threat". In other words, the goal of creating a kind of conditioned "negative reflex" to socialism is being pursued essentially. The pages of the book devoted to this subject show how sophisticated and subtle the science of manipulation of the social consciousness now is. We would note that the author is entirely justified in not confining himself here to the task of exposing anti-Soviet propaganda but makes excursions

into psychology itself from time to time. Such a scientific background of the exposition helps us gain a better, fuller idea of what a truly dangerous and poisoned weapon is being employed by anti-Soviets today and why their "product" is, unfortunately, sometimes by no means ineffective.

The logical and necessary culmination of the work is the subject of counterpropaganda. The urgency of the latter--particularly skilled, wide-ranging, aggressive and effective, of course--is now a command of the times and an imperative political and ideological necessity. V. Artemev is perfectly correct to emphasize that counterpropaganda must take fully into account the tricks and methods with which anti-Soviets operate, but, nonetheless, its main content has always been and will remain the struggle of ideas. And in this sense counterpropaganda constitutes an inalienable part of the party's general ideological activity (p 246). The central task of this work is a rise in the class, political consciousness of the working people and the inculcation of communist conviction. It is these qualities which should serve as the reliable barrier against which all turbid waves of anti-Soviet propaganda will break.

Counterpropaganda must in no way be reduced to a proclamation and repetition of some common truths and propositions. This is not enough. It must be distinguished not only by high ideological content but also avail itself of definite methods and be flexible, opportune, specific and intelligently planned. "Counterpropaganda," the scholar writes, "is primarily a permanent consideration of the basic ideas, notions, evaluations, factual information, sentiments and rumors which are disseminated or could be disseminated by an ideological enemy for the formulation of our own optimum propaganda line and the preparation of specific propaganda material" (p 248). The reader will find in the work skilled judgments concerning how to practice really effective counterpropaganda, imparting to it a preventive, expository, aggressive nature (pp 252-267).

The extraordinary topicality and importance of the theme chosen by the author forces us to make higher-than-usual demands on the book. And I would like to express certain wishes from this viewpoint. The work would undoubtedly have benefited had it contained more counterpropaganda material refuting the fabrications and inventions of the anti-Soviets. Correspondingly, it would have been worthwhile expanding the final chapter, the most important one from the viewpoint of our practical-political requirements ("Counterpropaganda as Part of the Ideological Struggle"), which proved to be the shortest. It would have been beneficial to have formulated more specifically the counterpropaganda recommendations which are contained in the monograph. The question of exposure of the activity of the USSR's enemies in the areas where the hottest ideological-propaganda battle is currently under way between socialism and imperialism--the arms race and disarmament, security in Europe, prevention of the creation of new types of weapon of mass annihilation and so forth--probably requires more attention. But all these are, of course, recommendations for an improvement in what is, even as it is, a necessary, valuable work.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 18'6/2

SIBERIAN INSTITUTE STUDY OF CAPITALIST ECONOMIES REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA In Russian No 10.
Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 143-145

[A. Poletayev review: "Economic Analysis--Possibilities of Modeling"]

[Text] For a number of years the USSR Academy of Sciences Siberian Department Institute of Economics and the Organization of Industrial Production has been developing a system of econometric models of developed capitalist countries--the United States, Japan, the FRG and Great Britain. The monograph in question * continues the series of publications prepared by the institute devoted to an analysis of the capitalist economy with the application of modeling and demonstrates interesting possibilities of its use.

Two important problems have been made the center of the study: the influence on economic dynamics of state regulation and cyclical processes. Both these questions are exceptionally relevant at the present time. As is known, the increased instability of the capitalist economy which has been observed in recent decades and the increased depth and duration of crisis processes have been accompanied by an intensive search for new forms and methods of state influence of the economy and a shift of accents in the anticyclical policy of the governments of developed Western countries.

So-called "Thatcherism" in Great Britain and "Reaganomics" in the United States serve as the most striking examples of new economic policy. Their political essence is quite obvious--both programs express the interests of the most conservative circles and are oriented primarily toward the support of big business. The second aspect of state intervention in the economy--the active offensive against the working people's rights and reduced spending on social needs--is inseparably connected with the latter. A further key element of the program of the R. Reagan administration is a gigantic increase in arms spending.

Not only a qualitative but also quantitative evaluation of state economic policy and determination of the degree of its influence on the dynamics of basic economic parameters, on the course of the economic cycle included, are of interest in this connection. The use of model methods affords considerable possibilities for tackling this task.

* Yu.A. Chizhov, "Dinamika sovremennoy kapitalisticheskoy ekonomiki" [Dynamics of the Contemporary Capitalist Economy], Novosibirsk, Siberian Branch of Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1984, p 175.

Both the actual effect of state measures and the potential impact of a proposed program of measures for the subsequent development of the economy of this country or the other may, in particular, be evaluated on the basis of econometric models. The monograph evaluates this potential impact of the economic programs of the last three U.S. presidents--G. Ford, J. Carter and R. Reagan. Study of the influence on the economy of official policy programs and not actual measures would appear entirely justified, in our opinion. As a rule, these programs are not embodied in full in practice, and their implementation bears the imprint of the domestic political struggle, the alignment of forces in Congress and so forth. In the original versions the U.S. presidents' economic programs appear in "pure" form. In addition, such an approach affords an opportunity for the development of a procedure of evaluating the potential effect of the new programs which could emerge in the future.

Simulation calculations permit the author to conclude with full justification: "From the viewpoint of the dynamics of the capitalist economy the measures of the Ford and Carter programs led only to negligible deviations from the trajectory determined by the interplay of cyclical forces and intrinsic contradictions in the U.S. economy" (p 122).

A key element in President R. Reagan's economic program, which he announced at the start of 1981, was the tax reform plan. At the same time, however, the model estimates show that the tax and depreciation allowances offered the corporations had inevitably to lead (and, as practice showed, did lead) to an appreciable increase in the depth of the decline in basic economic indicators and a growth in unemployment at the end of 1981 even. The negative impact of this program on accumulation was reflected in full in 1982. As far as the economic recovery which began in 1983 is concerned, the simulated results graphically testify that the emergence from the crisis occurred mainly under the effect of spontaneous cyclical forces and not thanks to measures of fiscal regulation (p 125).

Thus the author succeeded in obtaining further convincing evidence that actual economic development proceeds under the predominant influence of intrinsic cyclical forces. The attempts by bourgeois propaganda, on the other hand, to explain the decline in production in the period of crises by errors in the choice of economic policy and the emergence from them by the stimulating impact of this government program or the other are completely groundless.

The aggressive policy of the present Washington administration, its spurring of international tension and the unprecedented increase in military spending make exceptionally topical the question of the influence of the arms race on the economy of the United States itself. To justify the inordinate budget appropriations for military needs representatives of the White House, as, equally, the President himself, are publicizing the stimulating influence of military spending on economic growth. However, in reality, as the analysis made by Yu. Chizhov testifies, the reverse situation is observed.

In particular, the 1953-1954 intermediate crisis was largely connected precisely with the consequences of the U.S. aggression in Korea. Given an absence of the corresponding growth in military spending and the numbers of

servicemen, the economic recession would have proved far less profound and lasted no more than two quarters (instead of the four in reality) (p 129).

The negative influence of militarization on the economy was reflected even more graphically during the war in Vietnam. Although the escalation of military spending and the increase in the prices of the "lethal commodities" and the number of servicemen and their wages accompanying it contributed to a certain rise in the economic growth rate at the end of 1965 and in 1966 and eased the depth of the 1967 recession (pp 130-132), the artificial padding of economic growth was not without result for the American economy. Primarily, as model calculations show, the 1969-1970 crisis became more profound. Given the absence of the Vietnam war, the depth of this crisis would have been appreciably less--for example, net investments would have declined only 5 percent compared with 12 percent in reality (ibid.). The influence of military spending on the rate of inflation was even stronger--without an escalation of military operations prices would have risen in the period 1967-1972 by 20 percent, whereas in reality they increased in this period 30 percent (p 133).

The estimates adduced in the monograph testify convincingly that military appropriations have a far less stimulating impact on economic growth than state spending geared to civil needs. The temporary rise in the economic development rate invariably results in a rapid growth of negative phenomena in the economic system--an acceleration of inflation, an increase in budget deficits and an intensification of crisis phenomena. Thus the arms race not only jeopardizes the preservation of peace but exerts a negative influence on the economy of the United States itself.

Naturally, all the possibilities of model study of the dynamic characteristics of the capitalist economy cannot be shown within the framework of a single work. Nonetheless, the absence of a corresponding analysis of official credit-monetary policy is to be regretted. Currently this set of instruments is occupying an increasingly large place in the economic policy of the United States and a number of other countries and performing no less a role than fiscal regulation.

The interpretation of the 1967 recession as a cyclical crisis (p 132) which the author proposes would seem highly contentious. The fact that given the absence of an escalation of military spending this recession would have been more appreciable cannot be regarded as proof of its cyclical nature inasmuch as this crisis or the other should be attributed to the cyclical category by proceeding from its actual impact on the course of the reproduction process.

We would emphasize the main point: the monograph in question develops a very important direction of the analysis of the capitalist economy and demonstrates the great possibilities which are revealed by use of economo-mathematical methods in this sphere. The book will be useful to both specialists and all who are interested in problems of the capitalist economy.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850
CSO: 1816/2

BOOK ON HISTORY OF U.S. MILITARY STRATEGY, BUDGET REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 145-147

[V. Dyakin review: "Through the Prism of the Military Budget"]

[Text] For an investigation of the problems connected with the new twist to the arms race spiral being added by American imperialism the author of the monograph in question* has opted for a distinctive angle of approach: he examines the long-term regularities of Washington's military-political strategy in close interconnection with the Pentagon budget. There are serious grounds for such an approach. The military budget serves as a most general indicator of the scale and rate of the buildup of military power and illustrates the material content and thrust of militarist activity. As Yu. Katasonov rightly emphasizes, an analysis of the content and dynamics of the American military budget makes it possible to get an idea of a number of important features and trends of the current military policy and regularities of the development of the militarism of the United States and its possibilities and limits in implementation of arms race policy (p 7).

The work reveals imperialism's purposeful preparation for an aggressive war against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and illuminates Washington's true motives concealed by arguments concerning the "Soviet military threat" and the "danger of world communism". The driving forces of militarist policy and its direct ties to the entire system of state-monopoly capitalism are disclosed.

The analysis of the indicators and technical singularities of the military budget affords an opportunity to take a look at a kind of "backstage" of the Pentagon, where various tricks with the data of military-budget statistics are invented. The book illustrates in detail the methods and means of disguising the true size of the financial base of American militarism and the hidden sources and extra-budget forms of financing military measures. The author refers to the results of calculations made repeatedly in the United States itself according to which the real scale of American military spending in the 1960's was at a

* Yu.V. Katasonov, "SShA: voyennaya politika i byudzhet" [United States: Military Policy and the Budget], Exec. ed. R.G. Bogdanov, doctor of historical sciences, Moscow, Izdatel'stvo "Nauka", 1984, p 192.

minimum 35-40 percent and by the end of the 1970's some 65 percent greater than the indicators of the official "National Defense" section of the federal budget (p 24).

The proposed periodization of the postwar dynamics of the military spending of the main imperialist country is of undoubted interest. Given a manifest long-term trend toward its growth, an unevenness of military financing is observed. The peaks of the first two periods in 1948-1955 and 1955-1973 pertained in the past to the major aggressive wars unleashed by the United States in Korea and Vietnam. It is natural to assume, therefore, that the present stage of the increase in military spending, which was initiated by Washington in 1974 and which it has stepped up sharply since 1980, cannot fail to have a truly ominous meaning: an increase in the actual military threat to all mankind on the part of American imperialism (p 40).

Upon an examination of the financial-economic base of the arms race the main attention is concentrated on the most important and highly characteristic periods in the history of American military policy: the frontier of the 1960's-1970's, when Washington was forced to consent to a slowing of the growth rate and somewhat of a reduction even in the size of the Pentagon budget, and the frontier of the 1970's-1980's, which was the start of a new, unprecedented spurt in the buildup of American military power.

By the end of the 1960's the militarist policy of the United States and the ambitious "flexible response" strategy which was the basis thereof, which was aimed at retaining strategic superiority, had encountered new realities in the international and domestic situation which had caused a considerable complication of the conditions for continuation of the arms race. The author also illustrates, *inter alia*, the considerable financial difficulties which forced Washington to reduce the growth rate of the military budget, alter the allocation of resources in respect of individual items thereof and abandon the implementation of certain programs.

The military-economic practice of those years in the United States, the author emphasizes, showed as obviously as could be the groundlessness of many of the myopic dogmas which were widespread at that time, including the ideas concerning the permissibility of the painless allocation for the economy of 10 percent of GNP for alleged "defense" needs and the absolute priority of military spending over civil spending (p 47). Deficit financing as a result of the increase in militarist appropriations became a very strong destabilizing factor which ultimately contributed to the growth of inflation and increased strain in the sphere of federal finances.

Analyzing the American policy of "sharing the burden" of military spending, the author emphasizes that it is aimed at enlisting the financial and other resources of the United States' allies for conducting a global arms race. In demanding of them that they increase their "contribution" to NATO's joint military preparations and also appreciably expand arms purchases Washington is attempting to shift onto its Atlantic partners a large proportion of spending and at the same time fully retain the dominant role in the bloc, which ensures specific military-economic benefits. Unfortunately, the interesting analysis of these questions is confined basically to the period of the 1970's.

The monograph reveals convincingly the duality of the approach of the Washington administration to problems of strategic arms limitation. It shows on the basis of numerous pieces of evidence how the negotiations and agreements in this sphere have been used extensively in the United States, contrary to their very spirit, for the energetic spurring of militarist preparations. Thus the leaders of the Pentagon have insisted on the implementation of many projects allegedly directly dictated by agreements, while the maximum quantitative levels of strategic arms systems established by the Vladivostok accords have become the official reference points of their plans and requests for appropriations in cases where the "ceiling" stipulated by the agreements were higher than the goals of the American military programs (p 63).

In examining the meaning of a number of subsequent adjustments to the United States' military-political strategy (at the start and in the middle of the 1970's and at the frontier of the 1970's-1980's) Yu. Katasonov emphasizes the continuity of Washington's line and the invariability of the principles of military superiority, the scale of whose realization has been determined by the budget framework.

The openly militarist course of the United States in the 1980's, we read in the book, "is a creation not only of the Reagan administration. It is the fruit of bipartisan policy formed over a number of years with the participation of several administrations" and the result of a "long concentrated offensive against detente by the most reactionary U.S. circles, which took advantage for their purposes of certain specific changes in the country's domestic situation and changes in the international situation" (p 6).

The evolution of the aims and practice of all Washington administrations in the sphere of the buildup of military power on a 10-year breakdown has been clearly manifested in the growth curve of the militarist budget. Its increase (in comparable prices) began in the period of the G. Ford administration, which bequeathed to its successors the basically already "assembled" and inaugurated "production line" of a new multiyear round of an arms buildup. The "Reagan team" jacked up the rate of this race, having sharply increased the annual growth of military spending in real terms. The work traces in detail the formation of the present administration's approach to military policy, the strategic "innovations" of the militarist course and the priorities of Washington's military program. The accelerated creation of nuclear potential and the accelerated buildup of general forces for preparation for waging wars of different types (limited, protracted and general) has caused a shift in the United States' militarist preparations in the direction of a sharp "increase in the aggressive nature and danger of the military activity of American imperialism" (p 118).

At the same time the author shows that opposition to the adventurist military-political course is broadening in the country. "The present-day situation in the United States," he writes, "has a certain similarity to the situation of the start of the 1970's: now, as then, following a particularly vigorous splash of a wave of militarism (at that time this was the escalation of the 'dirty war' in Vietnam, now escalation of the arms race), a powerful upsurge of the antiwar movement grows in the country" (p 157).

It should be said that not all sections of the monograph in question are of equal worth in the plane of their organic connection with budget-finance aspects of military preparations in the United States. Further development of the problems at the junction of the economy and policy of present-day American imperialism which it examines would seem very important. As a whole, however, Yu. Katasonov's book is undoubtedly a topical, meaningful study of interest to a broad range of specialists and international affairs propagandists.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850
CSO: 1816/2

SWISS STUDY OF U.S.-SOVIET ARMS TALKS REVIEWED

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNNYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian No 10, Oct 85 (signed to press 13 Sep 85) pp 147-149

[L. Vadimov review: "USSR and the United States: Comparison of Approaches to the Problem of Disarmament"]

[Text] The author of the monograph "Assumptions and Perceptions in Disarmament,"* is the well-known political scientist D. Frei, director of Zuerich University Center for Foreign Policy Studies.

The intention of the book is unusual for Western political science. The scholar has set himself the task of "ascertaining the views and evaluations of the governments of the USSR and the United States in respect of one another, primarily in the delicate sphere of disarmament, that is, in a sphere embracing both strategic rivalry and attempts to limit it by means of disarmament negotiations and arms limitation" (p VII). A further distinguishing feature of the study is the author's endeavor to depart from the canons of "Sovietology". He endeavors to put the emphasis not on an exposition of traditional long discredited outlines but on a detailed study of primary sources--documents of the CPSU and Soviet Government for the past 5 years. Mention also has to be made of the great political topicality of the work. The question of the need for political thinking which corresponds to the realities of the nuclear age is now more acute than ever under the conditions of the growth of the nuclear threat and the development of an extraordinarily dangerous round of the arms race. The comparison of the approaches of the two strongest powers of the world to key problems of international security and disarmament may provide food for serious, instructive conclusions for scientists, politicians and diplomats.

Analyzing the Soviet Union's approach to questions of international security and disarmament, D. Frei distinguishes such features thereof as the consistent and systemic nature of conceptual aims and continuity combined with flexibility. Evaluating skeptically the attempts of a number of Western Sovietologists to find some "differences" in the views of the Soviet leadership on problems of war and peace, arms limitation and disarmament, he writes: "...the search for differences reflecting hidden clashes... is probably a futile exercise" (p 26).

* Daniel Frei, "Assumptions and Perceptions in Disarmament," United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, New York, 1984, p XIV 321.

however, in describing the theoretical foundations of the Soviet approach to key problems of international politics the Swiss scholar drops his main distinguishing feature--a profoundly scientific character. The systemic nature and continuity of the USSR's policy in questions of the security of the peoples and disarmament is explained by no means by "the inertia of the machinery of state's," as the book in question claims, but by the fact that determination of the long-term trends of world development is based on the achievements of progressive Marxist-Leninist theory.

Unfortunately, the main question, which should have been at the center of the study--ascertainment of the degree of correspondence of the theoretical aims of the foreign policy of the USSR and the United States to the objective requirements of world development--remains beyond the author's field of vision. He concentrates his attention on a comparison of individual provisions of official foreign policy documents of the two states, availing himself here of the set of instruments developed by Western political psychology. The conscious departure from the formulation of the "elements of strategic thinking" of the two sides which he distinguished to the context of actual policy markedly reduces the value of the considerable preparatory work performed by the researcher in collating and systematizing the corresponding material.

Thus, upon an examination of the views of American ruling circles on the correlation of forces between the USSR and the United States in the first half of the 1980's D. Frei concludes with reference to certain Pentagon documents that in Washington "it evidently continues to be the uniform opinion that essential equality is maintained between the United States and the USSR." However, how to combine this conclusion with the statements of President's R. Reagan, who claims that "the heart of the problem is that the Soviet Union has clear superiority"? And, what is most important, how to combine the statements of the U.S. Administration concerning its adherence to the principles of stability and parity between the two countries with the actual deeds of the U.S. leadership, which is endeavoring to acquire first-strike potential and working simultaneously on the creation of an antimissile "shield" capable of protecting an aggressor from retribution?

The author describes in detail and correctly as a whole the present U.S. Administration's approach to the negotiations with the USSR on disarmament issues, an approach the basis of which is the simple "philosophy" of negotiating with an allegedly untrustworthy partner (pp 148-150). It would, however, be naive to explain the causes of the appearance of this, so to speak, "new approach" by the American leadership's demonstrative "disenchantment" in connection with the course of the Soviet side's compliance with arms limitation agreements concluded earlier. Its essence consists of an attempt to impose on the other side one-sided agreements, threatening a new round of the arms race, and simultaneously to avoid negotiations wherever and whenever Washington does not have sufficient "bargaining chips".

As a result of the comparison of the viewpoints of the USSR and the United States on problems of international security and disarmament D. Frei reaches the conclusion of the existence in these views "together with differences of a striking similarity and symmetry" (p 265). He lists 28 identical "types of

processes of perception" of international relations which he has discovered in the views of both sides and which constitutes in sum "a powerful mechanism influencing the ideas of each of them concerning the enemy and oneself". This mechanism, the author believes, is capable of distorting the thinking of a state's leading circles. Of fundamental importance here, D. Frei believes, is the fact that the existence of a conflict between the two states is giving rise to a specific type of processes of cognition--so-called "conflict cognition" of one another (pp 274-275).

Such a concept gives rise to serious objections both theoretically and practically. After all, it can hardly help to explain the transition from cold war to detente and the constructive cooperation of the United States and the USSR on a number of problems of limiting the arms race which took place in the 1970's: the mechanism of "conflict cognition" would have made such a change in world politics inconceivable. Nor is it possible to agree with the author's propositions that a "black and white view of the world," perception of relations with United States as a "zero-sum game" and so forth are characteristic of the Soviet Union. A mechanical division of all countries into "friends and enemies" and the separation and, even more, the counterposing of the security of the USSR to the security of other states are alien to Soviet foreign policy. It is sufficient to recall in this connection Soviet diplomacy's advancement of the principle of equal security for all on the basis of states' common efforts. This principle, naturally, has nothing in common with the "zero-sum game" principle, in accordance with which a gain by one side inevitably results in an equivalent loss for the other. Soviet diplomacy's support for an adoption of a whole number of initiatives and proposals such as Finland's proposal concerning the creation of a nuclear-free zone in North Europe, Sweden's initiative concerning the creation of a zone free of battlefield nuclear weapons in Central Europe and the ideas contained in the well-known "four continents' initiative" indicates the attentive consideration by our foreign policy of the interests of other states and peoples.

Assessing the possibilities of the two states reaching mutual understanding on problems of international security and disarmament, D. Frei concludes that the views of the American side "are more useful, albeit imperfect for an evaluation of the situation which would also be acceptable to the enemy" (p 285). This conclusion reflects in full measure the vulnerability of an approach in accordance with which the positions of the USSR and the United States' are analyzed according to formal outward indications. Yet expansion of the framework of the study and comparison of views of the two sides on fundamental questions of world politics from the standpoints of other states and influential present-day forces provides a completely different answer to the question posed by D. Frei as to whose approach--the Soviet or American--is more suitable as a basis for mutual understanding. Proof of this are the numerous General Assembly resolutions (which are completely unused, incidentally in the work, which was published under the aegis of the UN Institute for the Study of Disarmament) submitted by the Soviet Union and approved by the majority of states of the world on the key questions of curbing the arms race and removing the threat of nuclear war.

Only an unprejudiced, objective comparison of declared positions and actual actions in support of peace and disarmament may serve as a reliable basis for a serious analysis of states' approaches to the most acute problems of the present day.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo TsK KPSS "Pravda". "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya". 1985

8850

CSO: 1816/2

END

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

16 January 1986